



REFORM BILL.

Kensington, 12th April, 1832.

I AM almost tired of writing the above two words: they have been before my readers so long, that the sight of them becomes what that of the spade is to a digger, a thing rather displeasing than otherwise. "What!" exclaims to himself every man that has any sense and spirit left: "What! are we yet without this bill! Are *three or four hundred men* still debating whether *twenty millions* shall remain in a state of degradation, and sixteen or eighteen millions of them in actual misery, or be restored to their rights and to happiness! Are these three or four hundred *still debating*, whether the pension, sinecure, grant, allowance, and dead-weight lists shall, or shall not remain, to press the working people to the earth! Are they still *deliberating* whether we shall, at the end of eighteen years of profound peace, pay for a standing army as great as we had to pay for in war, and pay, at the same time, for a *gendarmerie à la Bourbon*, with swords by their sides! Are they still making it a *question*, whether we shall continue to pay tithes to this church, and pay *poor-rates* and *church-rates* at the same time! Are they, *they*, still making it a matter of *debate*; *THEY* making it a matter of *debate*, whether the eighteen *working millions*, who make all the food and all the raiment, shall have anything but potatoes to eat, and anything but rags to cover them!" Such are the indignant exclamations of every man of sense and spirit, when he sees the above

two words in print, and when he reads the stupid and impudent stuff which the publishers of newspapers put forth, under the name of "*debates*," and which publications would disgrace any club of sots, met for the purpose of smoking and drinking. I shall, however, notice (and I do hope for the last time) the stuff, called speeches, that have now been published under the name of *debates of the Lords on the Reform Bill*; premising that I do not ascribe the stuff to the Lords, but look on it as the copy proceeds of the brains of a parcel of stupid *reporters*, who must have been *drunk* into the bargain, and must have smelt as strong of offal gin as any pig-sty of any distiller in the vicinity of this beastly WEN.

The SECOND READING of the bill was moved by Lord GREY, on Monday, the 9th instant. But, before that motion, the Duke of BUCKINGHAM (Grenville) presented a petition against the bill, and gave notice of his intention to bring in *another bill* if this were thrown out. This is important matter, and therefore I will take the words of the *reporters*.

"The Duke of BUCKINGHAM presented a petition from freeholders of the county of Buckingham (as we understood), against the Reform Bill at present before the House, on the ground that, although a moderate reform might be necessary and expedient, this bill was revolutionary. The petition was most respectably signed. He did not think it necessary to state its contents more particularly. But, on moving that it be laid on the table, he would take the opportunity of giving notice that, in case the second reading of the Reform Bill now before the House should be negatived, as he sincerely wished and confidently hoped it would be, it was his intention, on Monday next, to bring in a bill for giving two representatives in Parliament to those large towns which, by their opulence and commercial importance, were entitled to be

“represented, although at present they
 “were not represented. This would be
 “the first object of the bill. A second
 “object of the bill would be to conjoin
 “and consolidate certain boroughs, each
 “of which now returned two members to
 “Parliament, so as to return two mem-
 “bers for the consolidated boroughs; the
 “purpose of this being to prevent the in-
 “convenience of an addition to the pre-
 “sent numbers of the House of Commons
 “by the introduction of members for
 “places not before represented. And a
 “third provision of the bill would be to
 “extend the elective franchise to persons
 “not now entitled to vote, so as to prevent
 “the abuse of the elective franchise in
 “boroughs. In order to prove that he
 “was seriously resolved to bring in this
 “bill in the event which he had men-
 “tioned, he proposed that the notice
 “should be entered in the books, and
 “that the Lords be summoned for Mon-
 “day next.”

Good! So we have now *two parlia-
 mentary reforms!* Instead of no reform
 at all, we have the two parties contend-
 ing for the honour of giving us a reform!
 How different from the declaration of
 the *Duke of Strathfieldsay*, when he was
 our *Prime Cock!* And let us now,
 before we go any further, see what that
 declaration was, for it is a thing, not
 only not to be *forgotten* by the people,
 but something for a reformed Parlia-
 ment to take into view, when they will
 be inquiring (as I trust they soon will
 be) into past transactions, and particu-
 larly into transactions connected with
 this man. The declaration, as published
 in the newspapers, was as follows:—

The Duke of WELLINGTON. “But then
 “the noble Earl had recommended the
 “expedient of *Parliamentary Reform*,
 “and remarked that he did not think
 “that the Government was as yet pre-
 “pared with any plan on the subject.
 “The noble Earl was right, for cer-
 “tainly the Government was not pre-
 “pared with any plan of Parliamentary
 “Reform. I will go further, and say,
 “that *I never heard that any country*
 “*ever had a more improved or more*
 “*satisfactory representation than this*
 “*country enjoys at this moment.* I do

“not mean to enter upon that subject
 “now, as it is probable we shall have
 “abundant opportunities to consider it
 “afterwards; but I do say that this coun-
 “try has now a Legislature *more calcu-*
 “*lated to answer all the purposes of a good*
 “*Legislature than any other that can*
 “*well be devised*—that it possesses, and
 “deservedly possesses, *the confidence of*
 “*the country*, and that its discussions
 “have a powerful influence in the
 “country. And I will say further, that
 “if I had to form a Legislature, I would
 “create one—not equal in *excellence to*
 “*the present*, for that *I could not ex-*
 “*pect to be able to do*, but something
 “as nearly of the same description as
 “possible. I should form it of men
 “possessed of a very large proportion
 “of the property of the country, in
 “which the landholders should have a
 “great preponderance. I, therefore,
 “am not prepared with any measure of
 “Parliamentary Reform, *nor shall any*
 “*measure of the kind be proposed BY*
 “THE GOVERNMENT AS LONG
 “AS I HOLD MY PRESENT POSI-
 “TION.”

We have this, then, *safely upon re-*
cord; and, it never ought to be forgotten
 by the people of England. If we were
 to believe the drunken *reporter*, “his
 Grace of *Strathfieldsay*” has softened
 somewhat; for the reporter says, that,
 in this *debate*, he said, that when the
 Duke of Buckingham’s Bill came before
 the House, he would give it *his best con-*
sideration, with a view to see, *whether*
it could be safely passed into a law!
 Oh, oh! he is becoming complying,
 then, is he! If he be ready to consider,
 whether *disfranchisement, enfranchise-*
ment, and extension of suffrage, may
 not safely be adopted, what becomes of
 his declaration of 2nd November 1830?
 That is gone, at any rate; or, rather, it
 remains, and will live for ever as a
 standard of the size of his capacity for
 governing a country. A little while be-
 fore he made this memorable declara-
 tion, I advised him to give *some little re-*
form, as the effectual means of keeping
 the hungry Whites out of place. Thank
 God, he did not follow my advice; for
 if he had, we might have been noodled

along for another year or two, gaping for the further good things that he had in store for us. He now sees his error; but he sees it *too late*: like all men of this description, he becomes *wise* by tasting the fruits of his *folly*. What! It was bad enough to see him and his equally-wise colleague, PEEL'S-BILL-PEEL, tuck about, and propose *Catholic Emancipation*; but that was nothing to this; for here, if the *reporter* do not lie, he is ready to consider, whether that may not be *changed*, which he declared to be the most perfect system of legislation that the world had ever seen, and the equal of which no human wit could devise.

Having read the *reporter's* account of what passed in this *debate*, I shall remark on certain parts of it, knowing, at the same time, that to do even this, demands some apology to my readers. The debates have gone, as far as Wednesday night, this being Thursday morning. They are to end, it seems, on Friday, owing to the complaisance of Lord GREY towards the Strathfieldsay-Duke; and here let me stop to observe, that Lord Grey has lost, with the country, more by his unaccountable complaisance towards this man than it is possible for me to describe. The main body of the people are *sincere*; and they find it extremely difficult to believe, that the Minister can be sincere towards them, while he carries his complaisance to such a surprising extent, towards this great enemy of their cause, whose insulting declaration of 1830 they have never forgotten and never will forget, and with which declaration, I, for my part, have yet not done. In truth, Lord GREY has suffered prodigiously for his general complaisance towards the enemies of reform. STURGES BOURNE, for instance, quitted his seat rather than support reform, and the Minister seems to have been hugging him to his bosom ever since. HORACE TWISS lost his seat by his strenuous opposition to the first bill; and Lord GREY gives him a sinecure place, and he is now writing pamphlets against his Ministry and his measures. In short, to have been a bitter opponent of the bill and an abuser of the people

seems to have been a title to favour with this Ministry, ever since they have been in power. For this reason their sincerity has been suspected, and is yet suspected, by every body. The people are indignant at seeing themselves taxed for the support of great swarms of the openly-avowed enemies of that reform which they are all so anxious to obtain.

The bill, if it pass a second reading, is, it seems, to go into a committee on Monday next; so that we shall soon know the result. With regard to the speeches, they contain, and they could contain, *nothing new*; but, there are two or three topics on which I shall offer a few remarks.

First, with regard to the charge so often made against Lord GREY of having been the cause of all this stir in the country, by having *unnecessarily* proposed his Reform Bill, Strathfieldsay's Duke is reported to have said this in the following words:

The conduct of the Ministers has placed the country in this condition; and before the question can have a calm and deliberate consideration, *they ought to place the country in the state, as regarded this question, in which it stood before.* (Cheers.) Are we to be hurried on in this state of things, with a measure which no one had attempted to prove to be practicable? (Cheers.) Is the security of all the institutions of the country to be brought to risk, because the House of Commons is in a state which prevented it from giving to this bill a deliberate consideration? (Cheers.) My Lords, I cannot think that the difficulties which have prevented the Commons from duly considering this bill, and from taking the course which would have been consistent with its own character, and with the safety of the constitution, are of a permanent nature. They have been created by the Government. (Cheers.) They are only temporary; and they can, and they ought to be removed by the Government which created them. (Cheers.) Another reason which the noble Earl alleges for his change of opinion is, that the opinion of the country demands this bill. Now, my Lords, *I hold that there can be no doubt whatever that, from the close of 1829 to the beginning of 1831, there existed no opinion in favour of reform in this country.* (Hear.) I mean, my Lords, *no opinion generally prevalent amongst the people.* (Hear! and a laugh.) I repeat, my Lords, *that I believe the fact to be, that there was not any generally prevalent feeling on the subject of reform in that period.* (Cheers.) The fact was fully admitted in the discussions on the subject in the House of Commons, and has since been published to

the world. But when the revolution took place in France, and when Belgium set another example of the same nature, then a sentiment in favour of Parliamentary reform began to spread. (Hear.) That feeling was called into existence by the events which had occurred abroad, and it had a great influence on the elections which were then about to take place, and had, consequently considerable influence on the Parliament which met for the first time in 1830. The noble Earl opposite came into office at a time when such sentiments prevailed in Parliament and throughout the country. (Hear.) *But at that time both the House of Commons and the people would have been satisfied with a moderate reform*; but the noble Earl thought proper to dissolve the Parliament, and to bring on an election at a time of unparalleled excitement. (Hear.) There was no cause whatever for the dissolution at that time, for the House of Commons would then have passed a moderate Reform Bill. (Hear.)

What! was there no demand for reform from the close of 1829 to the beginning of 1831? How often will it be necessary to assert the contrary of this? There has been a demand for reform ever since I can recollect. I myself was in almost all the counties of England, in the first half of the year 1830: and I know that the cry for reform was more general and more loud than I had ever known it before. Doctor Black, in his paper of this day, has the following curious passage, which manifestly gives countenance to Strathfieldsay's assertions. The passage I allude to is this:—"A man cannot be always pulling down and rebuilding his house, for though he may be satisfied of its defects, on casting up the accounts, the inconvenience attendant on an alteration may induce him to submit as long as possible to these defects. In this way for instance, *the reformers*, aware of Mr. CANNING's sentiments with regard to reform, *agreed to waive the agitation of the question, in order not to throw difficulties in his way* at a time when they believed that his Ministry *would be highly* beneficial not only to this empire, but to Europe in general." This is as great a falsehood and as impudent a falsehood as ever was put upon paper. "*The reformers*" never agreed to any such thing: they detested CANNING as cordially as they had always detested

him. The history of the scandalous transaction, to which Doctor Black alludes, is this: CANNING became a minister in May 1827. Instantly the Whigs, with the exception of Lord GREY, ran, in greediness, towards the CRIB. Lord JOHN RUSSELL had, at that time, given notice of a motion for his Tonbridge-ware Parliamentary reform; but the old and insolent enemy of the people, CANNING, would have lost all his old friends, if he had not explicitly declared against Parliamentary reform. He did this, by saying that he would oppose it, in whatever shape or degree it might be proposed, *to the end of his life*. Hereupon Lord JOHN RUSSELL, Sir BOBBY, BURDETT, HOBHOUSE, and BROUGHAM, all tacked about: Lord John Russell withdrew his motion for the Tonbridge-ware reform; and he and Brougham both said, *that the people no longer wished for reform*. Lansdowne actually joined Canning, and became his secretary of state. And the *Edinburgh Review*, in an article written by this very MACAULAY, and published in the month of June 1827, almost called Lord Grey a stupid sot, for objecting to come into power, without being able to propose a Parliamentary reform! This was the occasion when BURDETT stuck his knees in CANNING's back. These fellows were agreed, indeed, to "*waive reform*;" and they would have agreed, upon their oaths, to abandon it for ever, upon condition of being admitted to the CRIB; but is Doctor BLACK warranted in describing this miserable crew as "*the reformers of England*?" Lord GREY did himself great honour by rejecting the overtures of Canning: he presented, in his conduct, such a striking contrast with the other mean wretches, that it became impossible for the nation not to have great confidence in him; and great confidence in him the nation has had on that very account. "*The reformers*" never waived their claim for one single moment; they remembered all the infamous abuse poured on them by CANNING; they despised the bands of literary hirelings, Irish and Scotch, who were well paid for singing the praises

of that insolent and shallow upstart; they execrated the Whigs, who were ready to join him and to abandon the cause of reform; and they loathed, even to sickness, that BURDETT, one-half of whose speeches for twenty years had been employed in reprobating the principles and conduct of that very CANNING. It was a crew of base Whigs rushing to the crib, and not the reformers of England, who entered into this villanous agreement.

Strathfieldsay's Duke finds no countenance here, therefore; and as to the subject of reform not having been agitated during the years 1829 and 1830, what a statement, what an assertion to be put forth in print; when it is notorious that the Duke's declaration against it; that that and nothing else, drove him out of office! Long before the Parliament met in the fall of 1830; long before the last French revolution took place; even before the prorogation of the previous Parliament, the cry for reform agitated the whole country; so that, to ascribe the stir now existing in the country to Lord Grey; to ascribe the discontents of the people to him and his bill, is the most monstrous act of injustice that ever was committed. Upon this part of the subject, the speech of my Lord RADNOR was complete. It was a complete defence of Lord Grey against this charge; a defence which neither he nor any one for him has ever before made.

But the best part of Strathfieldsay's speech is this: he is reported to have said, that, *if Lord GREY, when he came into power, had proposed a moderate reform, the people would then have been satisfied with it.* Indeed! Why did not *you*, then, propose that moderate reform? Why did not *you* yourself propose that, instead of declaring that *you* would never give any at all? I advised *you* to do it; but luckily *you* rejected my advice: *you* followed *your* own course; and now *you* are feeling the consequences of it; and I trust *you* will continue to feel them, *even unto the end of your life.*

Another and very important topic introduced into this publication of a

debate was, the expense which would be the consequence of making a reform of the Parliament. Strathfieldsay contended that reform of the Parliament, so far from relieving the people from any part of their burdens, will add greatly to those burdens; for that, *a much greater military force will be required to keep the people in order.* One would suppose it almost impossible that this could have been delivered in Parliament. However, it certainly does accord with that which the Ministers themselves have put forth. STANLEY, BABBINGTON MACAULAY, HOBHOUSE, and in this debate MELBOURNE, have all appeared anxious to declare that the reform will certainly bring the people no pecuniary relief; and if I thought that, I would *oppose* the reform as a cheat, as a scandalous fraud committed upon the people; nay, if I did not think it certain that the reform would bring us *cheap government*, and cheap religion, I would cast it from me as something too despicable to engage my attention for a moment. But now let us hear what Strathfieldsay is, by the *reporter*, made to say upon this subject; and I make no apology for dwelling upon this subject, for it is the all in all; and I declare beforehand, that the reform will not be worth a straw unless it give us government and religion *as cheap as those in the United States of America*; and I further declare, that, for my part, nothing shall induce me to sit in any Parliament more than one session, unless the people will support me, and that in the proper manner too, in my endeavours to produce that cheap government and that cheap religion. I do not want a parliamentary reform for the sake of a theory. I want it that I may get rid of the tax-gatherer; that I may be allowed to make my own malt, grow my own hops, turn my own fat into soap, keep what horses I like, keep what servants I like, keep what dogs I choose, have what windows I want without being liable to have my house rummaged, to be called before commissioners and judges, to be fined and imprisoned, or to yield half my substance in taxes and



in tithes. These are the things that I want a reform for. I want it that the taxes and tithes may not take away from the employers the means of paying the working people wages that will give them meat and bread, instead of potatoes. I want it, in short, for the purpose of getting rid of the taxes and the tithes. But the *reporter* makes Strathfieldsay assert, that reform will make me pay more taxes instead of less.

The noble Lord (his Majesty's Secretary of State) who has spoken on this subject, has admitted that this measure, extensive as it is, *will not relieve the distresses of the country. I say, my Lords, that it will deeply aggravate them.* But let us look further, and see whether the system itself is good, and whether it is likely to produce good to the country. If your lordships will take the trouble of examining into what has passed within the last two years in France, you will see that the French expenditure has been increased in that time fifty millions sterling beyond the usual expenditure. You will see that its ordinary budget, notwithstanding the study that has been applied to be as saving as possible, exceeds the budget of the former reigns—of the extravagant reign of the Bourbons—by the amount of ten millions sterling; and besides this, there is the extraordinary expenditure of fifty millions in two years. (Hear.) *Look at that, my Lords, as a system of cheap government—(hear),—and you will see that it is quite impossible to agree with the senseless assertions made on that subject.* Now let us see whether in this country this bill, supposing it to be passed, is likely to make the government cheaper than it is now. Let us ask ourselves whether the civil government will have more power to govern the country than it now possesses; *whether it is possible that the government can be carried on with a smaller proportion of the army.* I beg your Lordships to look at the transactions that have taken place at Paris in the course of the last two years, and see whether that has been the case. I am sure you cannot think so, when you see that while Louis XVIII. and Charles X. were on the throne, they were enabled to maintain the peace of Paris with a *gendarmerie* of from 500 to 1000 men; but that, since the Revolution of July, the Government has not had less than 60,000 men once a month put into requisition to maintain the peace of the city. (Hear, hear.) Why, with a government founded as this must be, on the sovereignty of the people, a government such as we must have, if we adopt this bill, *will any man tell me that the country under such a government will be able to have its peace preserved with a small body of military?* The disasters that occurred at Bristol were put down, my Lords, by ninety men, as soon as an officer was found who would employ the force entrusted to him.

Were the events at Lyons as speedily and easily quelled? I know, my Lords, that those events were of a larger nature, but they required not less than 40,000 of the best troops in France, headed by a most able general, the minister at war, and a prince of the blood, to put them down. Consider well, my Lords, first, the causes of this difference; and next see whether it is possible for you to expect that the civil government can be carried on as hitherto, under a government such as you will establish if you pass this bill. (Hear, hear!)

Here, then, it is *taken for granted* that there must be a stouter army still, and a much stouter *gendarmerie*, if the Reform Bill be passed, for that much greater disposition to riot will prevail amongst the people. What! let us see a little how this tallies with other objections that have been made to the bill. The great objection to the bill has been and is, that it gives too much power to the people; that it will make the members of Parliament dependant on the voice of the people at large; and the *reporter* makes this Duke say in this same speech, *that demagogues and not gentlemen will be chosen in the great towns; and that the members will act upon instructions immediately received from their constituents.* Put men of talent and integrity and public spirit, instead of "*demagogues*," and then all this is very true; and such really will be amongst the effects of the Reform Bill. But then, what becomes of this monstrous additional expense and additional force, of which the Duke is made to talk? Either the people, the whole mass of the people, will obtain additional power by this Reform Bill, or they will not; if the latter, then where is the ground of apprehension to the aristocracy? If the former, is there a man so senseless as to believe, that this all-powerful people, who will instruct their constituents what laws to pass, *will give them positive instructions to augment the military and gendarmerie force in order to keep themselves down and to make them pay taxes?* Upon one or other of the horns of this dilemma Strathfieldsay's *reporter* is fairly hung up; and let him get off if he can.

O no! The French story, as applied to us, is not worth a straw. The French are not represented, any more

than we have been for pretty nearly a hundred years past. Their present state arises, not from their having made a revolution in July 1830, but from their *not having made it*. From their having been amused and cheated; from their having, by base intrigues, been prevailed upon to suffer the old thing still to exist, with the mere change of the name of the man; from their not having believed me, who told them from the outset, that that LOUIS PHILIPPE was there to keep the nest warm for the house of BOURBON, and not for the purpose of giving them freedom and lightening their burdens. The brave people of Paris shed their blood for the deliverance of their country from the yoke of the Bourbons; but they suffered themselves to be amused with professions and symbols, while the yoke was again preparing to put upon their necks.

To make the cases analagous, our reform must be a *sham reform*; the members must still, in effect, be chosen by the aristocracy and not by the people, the people must become bewitched with the aristocracy; they must fall in love with those who rejected the bill of 1831; they must be ready to fall upon their bellies at the approach of a bishop, and look upon his benediction as communicating health, meat, drink, and clothing. All these must take place before the people of England, like the people of France, will be rendered more miserable by the change.

O no! STRATHFIELDSAY may be well assured that the people will never give instructions to their "*demagogues*" to add to the military force *in order to keep themselves down*. STRATHFIELD is, by this *reporter*, made to assert, that if this bill pass, England will have a government "*founded on the sovereignty of the people; and that, like the government of France, which is founded on the sovereignty of the people, the Government must have a monstrous military force to preserve the peace of the country.*" The mistake here is, in asserting that France has a government founded on the sovereignty of the people. It has it *not*. It has the *name*; and we have now the

name of representatives of the people. But the French have been cheated out of the *thing*; and if we were to suffer ourselves to be cheated out of the thing too, the reform would certainly add to our degradation and misery, and we should have to pay more than we do now for troops and gendarmerie. But we mean not to be cheated out of the thing; if we have the name, we mean to have the thing also; we mean that the reformed parliament shall take off the burthens that are squeezing us to the earth; we mean to give our members instructions to pass laws that shall give us cheap government, and that shall render military force and gendarmerie unnecessary to keep the peace of the country; we mean that general misery and its offspring, general crime, shall cease; we mean that men shall no longer be set to draw wagons and carts, and be put up at auction; we mean that our earnings shall no longer be swallowed up by the idlers, but that skill, care, vigilance, activity, and toil shall enjoy their reward; we mean, in short, that England shall again be what England was. This is what we mean; this is what we shall instruct our representatives to effect; and therefore the argument which the *reporter* gives to Strathfield is not worth a straw. But once more look at his dilemma: once more observe how this opposition to the bill stultifies itself: the bill is bad, because it will make the people all-powerful; because it will make the members obey the instructions directly given them by the people; and it is also bad because it will enable the government to add to the burdens of the people by the means of additional soldiers and gendarmerie! so that it will at one and the same time create an all-predominant democracy, and an irresistible military despotism! What a devil of a bill you have got for us, Lord GREY!

So much for the apprehensions which the *reporter* represents Strathfieldsay to entertain with regard to the additional expenses and additional force which the Reform Bill will occasion. And now, let me refer to the *reporter's* account of what he says was said by

BOSCAWEN. This man, whose title is that of Earl of FALMOUTH, seems to be still haunted with apprehensions ABOUT ME. In opposing the last bill, there were four of the noble persons who argued that the bill must be bad, because it would be likely that in its operation it would put me into Parliament. The *reporter* gives to this BOSCAWEN, upon this occasion, the following words:—"As the noble Earl never made a speech without referring to his borough of Downton, he would take the liberty of saying, that if the noble Lord was really one of those patriots who were prepared, as he said, to sacrifice everything to their country, that would be a very *unfortunate thing for Cobbett*, whom the noble Earl *once intended to put into Parliament for Downton*, but whom *the people would scarcely elect, if left to choose for themselves*. The noble Lord ought not to object so much to nomination, if he thought that it would be *for the good of the country that Cobbett should have a seat in Parliament*."

The meaning of this is, that if Lord RADNOR lose his power of nominating members, it will be an unfortunate thing for COBBETT, because, if the people be *left to themselves, they will scarcely elect the said COBBETT*; and that the loss of the borough must be regretted by Lord RADNOR too, if he think it for the good of the country that COBBETT should be in Parliament; because, by losing the borough, he would lose the power of putting the said COBBETT in Parliament. This reporter must have been drunk, I think. In CANNING's time nearly the whole of the set were regularly drunk twice a day. That was the glorious time for the "gentlemen of the press." I was told, that, meet them when you would, they were blubbing drunk, and did so smell of gin! Of late they have been more sober I believe, those of them that survived Canning's drenching: but still this reporter of BOSCAWEN must have shipped a pretty smart cargo of gin; for the man never could, I think, have said this.

Upon the supposition, however, of its having been said, let me, in the first place, ask Boscawen what authority he had for saying that Lord Radnor *once intended* to put me into parliament for Downton? Next, why he deems it unfortunate for me not to be likely to be put into Parliament? Next, upon what ground he asserts, that the people, if left to choose for themselves, would scarcely elect me? Ah! Boscawen, Boscawen! You either never said this, or you do not mean it. You mean the contrary; and I believe, and am thoroughly convinced, that if I were not in existence, this Reform Bill would pass without any creation of Peers; and now it is evident that it will not pass without such creation. And *don't pass it, then!* Don't pass it, I say! and I can tell you this, that a large part of the people do not care a straw *now* whether you pass it or not!

But, BOSCAWEN, if the people, being left to choose for themselves, *will scarcely choose me*, what becomes of all the arguments about the letting of demagogues into Parliament? BOSCAWEN, have you read my Manchester Lectures? If you have not, read them right away; and then you will know, to the weight of a hair, what you have to expect at my hands, at any rate. The word *demagogue* means, a man who stands forward in behalf of the people; though that corrupt pensioner JOHNSON, whose image is stuck up in St. Paul's, whence it will be removed, I trust, to leave a pedestal for that of Major CARTWRIGHT, calls a demagogue "a ringleader of the rabble." In the proper sense of the word, I am the greatest of all English demagogues. I have been lecturing on politics, I have been maintaining my *Manchester propositions*, in every great town in the north, as far as the northern confines of Yorkshire, with the exception I believe of Liverpool and Bradford, and I have everywhere maintained, that unless those propositions be acted upon to the full extent, a reform of the Parliament will be a delusion and a mockery. Every-where I have been received with every mark of approbation. In most of

the places where I have resided for more than a day, I have been at the house of some person of considerable property, who deemed it a favour to have me for a guest. Two or three words with my name, written by myself, have been begged, as a valuable present, by more than a hundred persons. No mark of disapprobation have I received, during the whole of more than half a hundred lectures that I have given. I travelled, during my absence in the north, including the journey thither and back, nine hundred and eighty odd miles. Altogether, I stood upon my legs, speaking, upwards of a hundred and thirty hours; that is to say, more than five days and five nights; during the same time, I wrote and sent to London manuscript for thirteen Registers; and I came home and set to work at my gardening, on the very afternoon of my arrival. Say or think what you will, BOSCAWEN, this is the stuff of which a member of Parliament ought to be made up.

But, BOSCAWEN, though I very well know that the certainty of my being a member of a reformed Parliament, if I choose; though I know that your assurance of this is a sort of criterion of the danger which you apprehend from the Reform Bill, do you think that I should come *alone*; that there are no other such men; that there are not scores, endued with the same or with equally efficient powers, and having youth into the bargain? Let us have the bill: that will create men I warrant you. There are men enough; and the people of England will have the sense to perceive, that it is not title and fortune that they want to represent them; but talent, knowledge, and courage; a love of the honour of their country; men who see in every labourer their *countryman*, and who take to themselves a share of the disgrace of seeing him robbed of the fruit of his toil. Experience has now taught the people of England, that, to be restored to their liberties and happiness, they must rely upon one another; and though you do not know it, the country every-where teems with clever and well-educated

young men. During my last tour, scores, and I might say, many hundreds of young men, sometimes twenty at a time, have crowded round me as I have been going out of the lecturing-places, one saying, as he shook my hand, "That is the hand that wrote the *GRAMMAR*;" another, "That is the hand that wrote the *PROTESTANT REFORMATION*;" another, "That is the hand that wrote the *ADVICE TO YOUNG MEN*." This was the case, more or less, at every place where I was. In hundreds of cases, the young men came on purpose to the inn or house where I was. Nor was this confined to the buoyant spirits of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the heart seems always upon the lips; but I found it the same every-where. And, observe, I am no clap-trap orator; I am no flatterer; I every-where even ridiculed the outcry against the Corn Bill, unless prayed for in conjunction with an abolition of tithes, and a repeal of the hop and the malt tax. And, do you think then, BOSCAWEN, that there is nobody but me? The country is full of men, and of knowledge and education too, resolutely bent upon the changing of this system.

You! You, indeed, talk of your Bibles and your schools! You talk of teaching the people! It is I who have taught the people. I have created a mass of young men hostile to corruption of every sort. "The education of the country," indeed. You want the education of the country represented; I know a tailor, and a journeyman-tailor too, living in a country town, where he has always lived, more really learned, a more able writer, possessed of more real knowledge as to public affairs, than forty-nine out of every fifty of the members of parliament that I have ever known or heard of. I have seen letters from him that ought to put to the blush the far greater part of those who call themselves gentlemen, whether as to grammar, language, or sentiment.

If the Peers were wise they would take this great change into consideration; a change wrought entirely by myself; and the more efficient for that;

because it has been uniform; because it has made such great numbers of young men sober, learned, full of knowledge, and thinking precisely alike. It would require but a very little sagacity to perceive, that against the operation of a cause like this, there is no protection for ignorance or corruption, however surrounded by power. This is the great cause that has been at work to defeat all the schemes of Scotch quackery. These schemes are the subject of laughter all over the country. There is no delusion that can now exist without being immediately detected. BROUGHAM and VAUX may send forth, even under *official franks*, his book of "*Useful Knowledge*." It will produce no effect except upon the risible faculties of the readers, none of whom will go through many pages. In short, I have taught the whole country, and of that teaching this monstrous system, against which I have so long been at war, now feels the effects.

But, Boscawen, if you be so sure, that the people, if left to choose for themselves, will not choose me, you must believe that they will not choose any men like me; that they will choose young lords and squires and dead-weight people, who abound as the sands by the sea. Well, then, you being sincere in that opinion, what danger is there in passing the Reform Bill? The house will be constituted as it now is: no demagogues will find their way into it: some rich merchants and manufacturers may; but they will be for upholding the system, rather than pulling it down; so that, you being sincere in your opinion, and being sure that to pass the bill will give great and general satisfaction, it would really appear to be a sort of madness to oppose the passing of this bill, or to endeavour to mutilate it in any degree whatsoever.

It becomes me, however, to be frank, and to tell you, that the people, ay even in the counties, will not always choose men for their title or their wealth; and that it must be a base set of people indeed who will elect a placeman, pensioner, sinecurist, grantee, retired allow-

ance-man, dead-weight-man, or any tax-eater, or any one closely related to a tax-eater. Those who would elect a person thus dependent on taxation, would deserve the most degrading slavery to the end of their lives. As to *rich men*, there is no positive objection; but the riches rather tend to disqualify than otherwise, unless they be accompanied with tried devotion to the cause of the people. It is very curious, that, during the last debate on the bill in the House of Commons, GEORGE ROSE (the son of the notorious old GEORGE) used as an argument against the bill, that the people would not elect rich merchants and manufacturers; and in proof of this, he mentioned the practice in America, where, he said, it was very difficult for a rich merchant to get elected; and that was the reason, he said, that the commercial affairs of the United States were *conducted so badly*! Thank you, GEORGE, for this argument. The United States had, at the end of the revolutionary war, no such thing as a three-mast ship. They have now a mercantile tonnage very nearly equal to that of England herself. A nation so prosperous; a nation where the peace is so well preserved; a nation where the working millions are so well off, this world does not contain, and has never contained; and if such be the effect of rejecting rich men as law-makers, let us, for God's sake, try the experiment! We have had rich men to make laws for us; and these poor legislators have, in the course of forty years, actually created a nation to rival us. Therefore, BOSCAWEN, hug not yourself in the hope that the people are now ready to throw themselves prostrate before title and wealth. Let us have the bill again, I say, and we will let you see what we will do with it; and if you will not let us have the bill, why, then, we will . . . do as well as we can without it; but if we have it, it shall be of some use to us I warrant you.

Now, as to the question, whether this bill will pass a second reading, I can form no judgment; whether new Peers will be made, so as to ensure the final passing of the bill without mutila-

tion, I can form no judgment neither; but this I know well, that, if Lord GREY be authorised to make the Peers and do not make them, so as to cause the bill to pass; and if he suffer the bill to be rejected without plainly stating to the nation that the king has not authorised him to make the Peers; that, in either of these cases, the public will and must believe, that he has all this time been contriving how he should cause his own bill to be defeated. I cannot believe that such will be the result. I will just add, that to suffer the ten-pound clause to be made less favourable to the people, would be an abandonment of the bill; a specific giving-up of the rights of the people. I trust that no such thing will take place: from the language of Lord GREY I should conclude that he has full power to make the requisite number of Peers. Having that power he will certainly use it; and then all will be well; and, if the bill pass *unmutilated*, I trust that the people will receive it with a resolution to give it a fair trial; and that the enfranchised towns will immediately set to work to deliberate and determine on the course which they shall pursue with regard to the fixing upon proper candidates.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE
PEOPLE OF PRESTON,

1. *On the Cultivation of Cobbett's Corn.*
2. *On the Lies of the FOOL-LIAR respecting it, and particularly on his Lies relative to Mr. DIDDAMS, of Sutton Scotney in Hampshire.*
3. *On his Charges against MITCHELL and SMITHSON.*

Kensington, 1st April, 1832.

MY FRIENDS,

GREAT as has been my satisfaction at seeing the success of my corn generally, it has in hardly any case been so great as in learning its success at, and in the neighbourhood of, PRESTON, where I saw so many fine specimens, and where

I saw every prospect of a great extension of the cultivation of the corn. I am now about to repeat *my instructions for raising the corn*; and I address myself to you in particular, because you have the misfortune to have to do with the FOOL-LIAR, who has been making all the efforts that his beastly stupidity would permit him to make for the purpose of preventing the working people from benefiting from this, as ARTHUR YOUNG calls it, "*the greatest blessing that God ever gave to man.*" It is curious enough that the FOOL-LIAR should so cordially pull with the PARSONS in this affair; for I have heard of several of them who have told the working people that the corn was *good for nothing*; and I know one of the latter, who had fattened a pig upon the corn, hold up a piece of the bacon to the parson, saying, "*Is't good for nought!*" However, I will first give you my instructions for the raising of the corn, and then the FOOL-LIAR shall yield us some sport, and we will find out, if we can, where that "*patrimony*" is of which he told you he had "*just received the rents,*" when he was called upon to pay for "*the medals.*"

Before I proceed further, however, I ought to notice, that when I returned home the other day, I found *numerous parcels of corn* from different counties, and amongst the rest, one parcel grown in *Westmoreland*. So that I have now received fine well-ripened corn from every county in England, CORNWALL excepted. The corn which I have now received from SUTTON-VALENCE in Kent, from HIGH-WYCOMBE, Bucks, and three ears that came without any name, *wrapped up in wool*, are amongst the finest samples that I have seen, and all of them finer than the average of my own corn; and I am very much obliged to all the gentlemen who have taken the pains to send me these samples. I would write to each of them if I had the time; but I have it not. They will have the satisfaction to see their cares and public spirit rewarded by the success of our undertaking; and they will have the pleasure to reflect, that the thing has been accomplished, not only without the aid, but, apparently, solely *against the wishes* of the Government!

Oh, no! it is not *corn*; not *puddings* and *bread* and *bacon* that they want the working people to have: "*nice 'taties*" are their favourites; so that they may have the meat and bread for themselves, and for those who uphold and wait on them! The *Irish-diet* (for English labourers) is their favourite; but the English labourers will not, thank God, live on it; and I hope that the Irish will not do it much longer. The *sword-bearing police* do not, I warrant them, live on "*nice mealy 'taties*."

INSTRUCTIONS TO LABOURERS FOR RAISING COBBETT'S CORN.

I will first describe this *corn* to you. It is that which is sometimes called *Indian corn*; and sometimes people call it *Indian wheat*. It is that sort of corn which the disciples ate as they were going up to Jerusalem on the Sabbath-day. They gathered it in the fields as they went along and ate it green, they being "an hungered," for which, you know, they were reproved by the pharisees. I have written a treatise on this corn, in a book, which I sell for two and six-pence, giving a minute account of the qualities, the culture, the harvesting, and the various uses of this corn; but I shall here confine myself to what is necessary for a labourer to know about it, so that he may be induced to raise, and may be enabled to raise enough of it in his garden to fat a pig of ten score.

There are a great many sorts of this corn. They all come from countries which are hotter than England. This sort, which my eldest son brought into England, is a dwarf kind, and is the only kind that I have known to ripen in this country: and I know that it will ripen in this country in any summer; for I had a large field of it in 1828 and 1829; and last year (my lease at my farm being out at Michaelmas, and this corn not ripening till late in October) I had about two acres in my garden at Kensington. Within the memory of man there have not been three summers so cold as the last, one after another; and no one so cold as the last. Yet my corn ripened perfectly well, and this you will be satisfied of if you be amongst the men to whom

this corn is given from me. You will see that it is in the shape of the cone of a spruce fir; you will see that the grains are fixed round a stalk which is called the *cob*. These *stalks* or *ears* come out of the side of the plant which has leaves like a flag, which plant grows to about three feet high, and has two or three, and sometimes more, of these ears or bunches of grain. Out of the top of the plant comes the tassel, which resembles the plumes of feathers upon a hearse; and this is the flower of the plant.

The grain is, as you will see, about the size of a large pea, and there are from two to three hundred of these grains upon the ear, or *cob*. In my treatise I have shown that, in America, all the hogs and pigs, all the poultry of every sort, the greater part of the oxen, and a considerable part of the sheep, are fatted upon this corn; that it is the best food for horses; and that, when ground and dressed in various ways, it is used in bread, in puddings, in several other ways in families, and that, in short, it is the real staff of life, in all the countries where it is in common culture, and where the climate is hot. When used for poultry, the grain is rubbed off the *cob*. Horses, sheep, and pigs, bite the grain off, and leave the *cob*; but horned cattle eat *cob* and all.

I am to speak of it to you, however, only as a thing to make you some bacon, for which use it surpasses all other grain whatsoever. When the grain is in the whole ear, it is called *corn* in the ear; when it is rubbed off the *cob*, it is called *shelled corn*. Now, observe, ten bushels of shelled corn are equal, in the fattening of a pig, to fifteen bushels of barley; and fifteen bushels of barley, if properly ground and managed, will make a pig of ten score, if he be not too poor when you begin to fat him. Observe that everybody who has been in America knows, that the finest hogs in the world are fatted in that country; and no man ever saw a hog fatted in that country in any other way than tossing the ears of corn over to him in the sty, leaving him to bite it off the ear, and deal with it according to his pleasure. The finest and solidest bacon in the world is produced in this way.

Now, then, I know, that a bushel of shelled corn may be grown upon one single rood of ground, sixteen feet and a half each way. I have grown more than that this last summer; and any of you may do the same if you will strictly follow the instructions which I am now about to give you.

1. Late in March (I am doing it now), or in the first fortnight of April, dig your ground up *very deep*, and let it lie rough till between the seventh and fifteenth of May.

2. Then (in dry weather if possible) dig up the ground again, and make it smooth at top. Draw drills with a line two feet apart, just as you do drills for peas; rub the grains off the cob; put a little very rotten and fine manure along the bottom of the drill; lay the grains along upon that six inches apart; cover the grain over with fine earth, so that there be about an inch and a half on the top of the grain; pat the earth down a little with the back of a hoe to make it lie solid on the grain.

3. If there be any danger of slugs, you must kill them before the corn comes up if possible; and the best way to do this is to put a little hot lime in a bag, and go very early in the morning, and shake the bag all round the edges of the ground and over the ground. Doing this three or four times very early in a dewy morning or just after a shower, will destroy all the slugs: and this ought to be done for all other crops as well as for that of corn.

4. When the corn comes up, you must take care to keep all birds off till it is two or three inches high; for the spear is so sweet, that the birds of all sorts are very apt to peck it off, particularly the doves and the larks and pigeons. As soon as it is fairly above ground, give the whole of the ground (in dry weather) a flat hoeing, and be sure to move all the ground close round the plants. When the weeds begin to appear again, give the ground another hoeing, but always in dry weather. When the plants get to be about a foot high or a little more, dig the ground between the rows, and work the earth up a little against the stems of the plants.

5. About the middle of August you will see the tassel springing up out of the

middle of the plant, and the ears coming out of the sides. If weeds appear in the ground hoe it again to kill the weeds, so that the ground may be always kept clean. About the middle of September you will find the grains of the ears to be full of milk, just in the state that the ears were at Jerusalem when the disciples cropped them to eat. From this milky state they, like the grains of wheat, grow hard; and as soon as the grains begin to be hard, you should cut off the tops of the corn and the long flaggy leaves, and leave the ears to ripen upon the stalk or stem. If it be a warm summer, they will be fit to harvest by the last of October; but it does not signify if they remain out until the middle of November or even later. The longer they stay out the harder the grain will be.

6. Each ear is covered in a very curious manner with a husk. The best way for you will be when you gather in your crop to strip off the husks, to tie the ears in bunches of six or eight or ten, and to hang them up to nails in the walls, or against the beams of your house; for there is so much moisture in the cob that the ears are apt to heat if put together in great parcels. The room in which I write in London is now hung all round with bunches of this corn. The bunches may be hung up in a shed or stable for a while, and, when perfectly dry, they may be put into bags.

7. Now, as to the mode of *using* the corn: if for poultry, you must rub the grains off the cob; but if for pigs, give them the whole ears. You will find some of the ears in which the grain is still soft. Give these to your pig first; and keep the hardest to the last. You will soon see how much the pig will require in a day, because pigs, more decent than many rich men, never eat any more than is necessary to them. You will thus have a pig; you will have two fitches of bacon, two pig's cheeks, one set of souse, two griskins, two spare-ribs.

It is quite sufficient, that the corn will fat hogs better than any other thing will fat them: it need do nothing else, considering the amount of the crop, to make it more valuable than any other crop. But, as food for man, it is more valuable

even than wheat; because it can be conveniently used in so many ways. We use the *corn-flour*, in my family, **FIRST**, as *bread*, two-thirds wheaten and one-third corn-flour; **SECOND**, in *batter puddings baked*, a pound of flour, a quart of water, two eggs, though these last are not necessary; **THIRD**, in *plum-puddings*, a pound of flour, a pint of water, half a pound of suet, the plums, and no eggs; **FOURTH**, in *plain suet-puddings*, and the same way, omitting the plums; **FIFTH**, in *little round dumplings*, with suet or without, and though they are apt to break, they are very good in this way; in broth, to thicken it, for which use it is beyond all measure better than wheaten-flour.

Now, to make **BREAD**, the following are the instructions which I have received from Mr. SAPSFORD, baker, No. 20, the corner of Queen-Anne-street, Wimpole-street, Marybone. As I have frequently observed, the corn-flour is not so adhesive, that is to say, clammy as the wheat and rye flour are. It is, therefore, necessary; or, at least, it is best to use it, one-third corn-flour and two-thirds wheat or rye flour. The rye and the corn do not make bread so bright as the wheat and the corn, nor quite so light; but it is as good bread as I ever wish to eat, and I would always have it if I could. Now, for the instructions to make bread with wheat-flour and corn-flour. Suppose you are going to bake a batch, consisting of thirty pounds of flour; you will have, of course, twenty pounds of wheat-flour and ten pounds of corn-flour. Set your sponge with the wheat-flour only. As soon as you have done that, put ten pints of water (warm in cold weather, and cold in hot weather) to the corn-flour; and mix the flour up with the water; and there let it be for the present. When the wheat sponge has risen, and has fallen again, take the wetted-up corn-flour, and work it in with the wheat sponge, and with the dry wheat-flour that has been round the sponge. Let the whole remain fermenting together for about half an hour; and then make up the loaves and put them into the oven. The remainder of the process every one knows. These instructions I have, as I said before, from

Mr. Sapsford; and I recollect also that this is the way in which the Americans make their bread. The bread in Long Island is made nearly always with rye and corn-flour, that being a beautiful country for rye, and not so very good for wheat. I should add here, that there is some little precaution necessary with regard to the grinding of the corn. The explanation given to me is this: that to do it well, it ought to be ground twice, and between stones such are used in the grinding of cone-wheat, which is a bearded wheat, which some people call rivets. This, however, is a difficulty which will be got over at once as soon as there shall be only ten small fields of this corn in a county.

Now, my friends, observe, that, do what you will, you cannot get more than about *two gallons of wheat* on a rod of ground ($16\frac{1}{2}$ feet square), when you can always, with proper care, get *eight gallons of corn*; that *half a single ear* of corn will plant the rod; that a rod of wheat requires for seed a *tenth-part of the crop*; that there must be a floor to thrash and winnow the wheat, and that the corn may be shelled by the fire-side. If a poor man have a little bit of wheat, he finds it very difficult to do anything with it; but a bit of corn he can manage as well as a great farmer can manage his fields. If he have a garden of only *ten rods*, only think of the value of ten times 215 pounds of flour; 2,150 pounds, or within a trifle of *six pounds of flour a day for the whole year*, besides 210 pounds of offal, enough to fat, with some properly-cooked potatoes, a good hog! But while the instances of this crop of a bushel to the statute rod are innumerable, let us suppose the average crop to be *one half of this*. Then there is nearly *three pounds of flour a day all the year round*, and half enough offal to fat a hog; and, observe, I do not here include the value of the *fodder*, which is very great; and, mind, the corn is only *five months* on the ground.

But, in short, I need write no more on this subject: the fine corn that I have received from all parts of the country convinces me; that I have done this great thing for my country, and especially for

the Labouring People, to reduce whom to live upon potatoes was the damned scheme, which the *sensible and resolute Labourers* have defeated. "WE WILL NOT LIVE UPON POTATOES."

When the *men of Kent* raised that motto, the fate of the *tithes* and the *funds* was sealed. If Englishmen could have been reduced to live upon potatoes; if they could have been brought down to the *Irish scale*, the basest of slavery would have been *the lot of us all!* The whole people owe their deliverance to the men of Kent. Ay, ay! The Whigs may go on with their *arming* and with their *other works*; but all will be of no avail, since they cannot make the millions of labourers live upon potatoes. I read, in the proceedings of the new *Mechanics' Institute*, at Manchester, a speech, in which it is remarked, and with apparent pride, that the members of *Mechanics' Institutes* NEVER RIOT! No, "*intellectual*" souls: not they! They commit *no violences!* "Nice '*taties*," and sea-weed and nettles, and shell-fish that have died a *natural death*; these keep their "*intellect*" unclouded by the load on the stomach. I am for loading the stomach with bacon and bread: the load may, indeed, be rather less "*celestial*," less abstracted from earthly matter; but, the *body* is all the better for the loading; and, one would think, that *mechanics* stood in need of bodies too.

But, now for the FOOL-LIAR, in connexion, in the first place, with *this corn*. The fellow has as much *low cunning* as any animal that ever existed, and his *disregard of truth* is equal to that of a *Negro*. Those who have had to do with *Negroes*, know how difficult it is to make them perceive *the difference between falsehood and truth*. Not one in a thousand of them can be made to see *any reason why they should not say that which it suits them to say at the moment*. The master of a black fellow, in Long Island, who had been sent to fetch up a cow out of the pasture, said, when the fellow came with the cow, "Did you put up the bars to keep the oxen in?" "O yes, Massa!" There was a barn, round the end of which he had come with the cow, and the words

were hardly out of his mouth, *before the oxen came round the end of the barn!* "Why," said I, "that fellow cannot reason any more than a beast; for, otherwise, he must have known that you would detect the lie in a *minute*." "Oh!" said he, "a minute is a long while: he would swear that he was not eating peaches, if you were to tax him with it, with peaches in his hands and with his mouth crammed with the pulp." Your FOOL-LIAR seems to be, in this respect, upon a *perfect equality with the Negroes*. He has all their *animal cunning*; and all their disregard of truth; or, rather, their want of capacity to distinguish between truth and falsehood. These two qualities would carry him very far, were it not for the counteracting power of his *all-predominant malignity*. The lying of the *Negroes* is of little avail to them, because *nobody believes them*; because it is the *fashion of the community* never to believe a word that they say. But, it is difficult to bring ourselves to look upon a *white man* in this light. Yet, as you will presently be convinced (if you be not already), as far at least as relates to this *corn-affair*, your FOOL-LIAR must be looked upon in precisely this light; and it is truly curious that, at the last *Somersetshire election*, they should have *held up a Negro* to call him "*brother Blackey-man!*"

Last year, at this time, I published the names and addresses of the gentlemen, in each county, to whom I was about to send corn, *free of all cost, even carriage free*, for them to *distribute gratis*, in their several neighbourhoods, especially amongst the labourers. It seemed impossible for the devil himself to find a bad motive in this; yet the FOOL-LIAR, seeing in this list the names and addresses of a number of persons, who, he naturally supposed, had a respect for me, availed himself of the power that YOU HAD GIVEN HIM TO FRANK LETTERS, to send to each of these persons a *printed paper*, most infamously slandering me, signed with his name; and, to this infamous publication he added, in *manuscript*, that the corn was "A FRAUD;" and he begged the persons to whom he

addressed the letters, not, by any means, *to give it to the poor people to plant!*

As I said before, as to *truth* and *falsehood*, he is on a level with the blacks; but, having *low cunning* also equal to theirs, one wonders how he could have thus made sure of his detection as LIAR, by so many documents under his own hand; and at this every one must wonder, until they reflect on the power of the fellow's *malignity*, which is so great that it overpowers all his Negro-like *cunning*. I remember Farmer BRAZIER of Worth, in Sussex, where THE LIAR lived for a while, saying, that at times, his very look was so malignant, that if a drop were to fall from his eyes, it would burn cloth, or any other substance, like *aqua fortis!* This was a strong figure, to be sure; but really if we look at the fellow's conduct about this corn, we cannot help believing that the farmer was right. The fellow is monstrously ignorant, to be sure: I remember him telling his audience, "I have lautely bin in Normany, Genmun; a great *forren country* in Vrance, Genmun." But brutally ignorant as he is, *he knew* that his lies upon this subject *must be detected* at the end of about *six months*. Yet so great was his malignity, so deadly was his hatred of me, that he put forth this lie with as much alacrity as if the *saving of his own carcase from a beating* (upon which point he is very tender!) had depended upon the success of the lie.

The six months ended; the lie was exposed; *two thousand and forty-three persons*, more than half of them *farm-labourers*, have (by themselves or neighbours) sent me samples of their crops; all sending *expressions of gratitude*; all delighted with their *future prospects*; many of them *execrating the slanderous liar*; and more of them expressing their contempt of so *beastly a fool*, who has thus sent documents all over the country, signed by himself, to be at all times produced, if necessary, to prove him fool and liar, without an equal in the world, amongst either *blacks* or *whites*. But now let me exhibit to you in detail some of the works of this malignant liar; and then, I think, you will agree with Farmer BRAZIER in the *aqua-fortis opinion*.

You may remember that, in the *Trash for December last*, and in the Register of the third of that month, I published a letter from Mr. ENOS DIDDAMS of Sutton Scotney, near Winchester, giving me an account of the fine crops of corn, growed by the labourers and others, in that and the adjoining parishes, composing those which I have called "THE LITTLE HARD PARISHES." Mr. DIDDAMS is a village shoemaker, a man very much respected, and he recommended himself to my notice by his zealous endeavours to save several of the men who were transported by the SPECIAL COMMISSION in Hampshire. I went, in the fall of 1830, to find out the WIDOW MASON, and I was directed to this Mr. DIDDAMS, as a person likely to give me information. I have known him ever since, and from all that I have seen and heard of him, I believe him to be a worthy man. Now, observe, on the 4th of December last, I heard that THE LIAR had *been received* into, and *entertained* in, the house of a man in Hampshire, who had been, and was, in the habit of corresponding and otherwise communicating with me; whereupon I at once told the latter that the communication between him and me must cease. Upon this he observed to me, that THE LIAR had been *received also by Mr. Diddams*, and that Mr. Diddams would, he was sure, *hold correspondence* with THE LIAR. I believed neither of these: I did not believe that Mr. DIDDAMS would let the fellow into his house, if he knew who he was; and, as to corresponding with him, I was sure that Mr. DIDDAMS would have his hand chopped off rather than do it.

However, I wrote to Mr. DIDDAMS to tell me what THE LIAR *said to him*, and *how he received him*. In answer I received two letters from Mr. DIDDAMS, which I shall insert here, without the smallest alteration, either in spelling, pointing, or any-thing else. It is the plain statement of a plain and sensible man, and a man of honesty and sincerity. When at Manchester, I wrote to Mr. DIDDAMS, asking his leave to *publish* the letters: he gave me leave, as you will see in an extract from a third letter. After this I showed the letters in

Lancashire and Yorkshire, particularly at Leeds. You will see what use THE LIAR made of his having got into Mr DIDDAMS'S house; and I told my *other correspondent* in Hampshire *that this would be the case*; and that, therefore, I must cease all correspondence with him.

MR. DIDDAMS'S FIRST LETTER.

Sutton Scotney, Dec. 6, 1831.

SIR,—Hunt call'd on me munday week past. You wish to know what he said to me and how I received him. I do not know a better way to explain it to you than to relate the whole of the conversation that passed between us as far as I can recollect. He stoped at the Wicket in his gig, I went out to him, *I did not know who he was*, he call'd me by name, and asked me if I was not a grower of Cobbett's corn, I said yes, he said he should like to see some. I said walk in Sir, I will help you to the site of some Directly. I showed him my corn what I had in the ear and also what I had shell'd. He said it was very fine, never saw any riper or better, he asked me what I meant to do with it; I told him, that in the ear I should save for seed, the other I should have ground, he asked me what it was good for then, I told him it would make very good puddings I was sure as I had tasted of it in that way, and I had been told it would make Bread, but I did not know that, but I should try it and then I should know. He said his opinion was otherwise.—He then asked me if there was many that planted the corn in this neighbourhood, I told him a great many in small quantity. Did it ripen well, I told him yes, in every instance. Did I think it would answer to plant a whole field. I told him yes, under proper cultivation it would pay better than any thing else. He thought it would not. Then he asked me how Mrs. Mason's Crop was, I told him very good. He said he had heard that this corn *would kill the pigs fed with it* by giving them *the murrin*, and by making puddings and bread with it it would *give people the yellow janders*. I told him that was not very likely in my opinion. Then he asked me *if I did not know him*. I said no. He said his name was Hunt, he asked me if I did not know what the people said of him. I told him *most people said he had sold himself to the Torys*. He asked me *if I thought so*. I told him *I did not know, but if he had I was sorry for it*. I thought at this time particularly every man ought to do his duty. *He said he had not nor never would*. I told him I did not wonder at his speaking against the corn now *I knew who he was*, as I had a letter by me which he sent last april saying it would not ripen and that it was a fraud, he did not seem to recollect any thing about it. I said it appears that you and Mr. Cobbett have a quarrel between you, but the nature of the Quarrel I do not know neither do I wish to

know, but I think you have acted very wrong in Speaking against the corn as you have and do now, when you see it will ripen well, and I as well as many more in this part of the country are sure it will answer a good purpose and prove to be a great good. And I said I would not talk any more on that subject. Then we began talking about the Reform. He said *the Bill would do no good*. I told him Mr. Cobbett's opinion was it would do much good, I mean the first Bill. He said he had a quarrel with Mr. Cobbett, but nevertheless *he Esteemed him highly as a publick man*. I told him if so how wrong it was in him to try to set the nation together by the ears through a personal Dispute; then he asked about *the masons*, and *Cook* that was hanged, and asked me if I did not recollect he made a motion in the house about the men that was transported. I told him yes. He said *he had been about to get information on that subject*, and he meant to *face the Attorney General* again when the parliment met. He said he was going to Wallop and could not stop longer. He said he knew the corn would ripen, but did not think it would come so fine in this country. This is all that passed between us as far as I can Recollect now. This is the substance of it at any rate, and I believe he went away some what Disappointed, he gave me three Little papers something *about his Speech at Leeds*, some time past, but I have not had time to Read it. I heard he was at Whitechurch the day after he was with me. I think he was with me about half an hour. I hope you and your good family are well, and I remain,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. DIDDAMS.

SECOND LETTER.

Sutton Scotney, Dec. 13, 1831.

SIR,—When I wrote last to you I told you all I could recollect about Hunt's visit to me since that time I have thought the matter over more particularly to myself, and what I have heard since fully confirms me in the belief that he is a — and that the object of his Journey to this part of the country, and his visit to me in particular was for no good; before he made himself known to me he asked me many strange questions. Such as *did I know the Barings*, what I thought of them, what I thought of *the state of people's minds*, and if they were Quiet, and did I think they would continue Quiet, and many such like Questions, but to all of them I gave no positive answer, or made no reply, for I assure you I received him as I allways do those that are Strangers, with great caution. Before he made himself known to me and was at the door he asked me *if I had any fire within, as his feet was very cold*, I said yes, he went in and warmed his feet, and then he asked me if I had *any Bacon in the house*, which I thought was a very Strange Question. He said he should like some fat Bacon and Bread, at these words

I was very much surprised. I thought surely there is something wrong. I said I had none but a piece of lean Bacon which was not fit to be Brought out to him nor did I offer to do it, though I had a nice peice of Bacon in the House that we dined off the day before (which was Sunday) with some of the cabbages that those plants I had of you prodused. And then he asked me how far it was to Wallop, I told him about eleven miles, he said he could reach there in time for dinner, and when he found he could get no Bacon of me he left directly. He never asked me to correspond with him, only after he was up in his gigg, and got as much as ten yards from the wicket where I was standing he looked round and said good buy, *I should be glad to hear from you at any time.* I nodded my head but made no answer. I have not wrote to him nor had I ever any intention to do it, for as soon as he was gone, my wife and me talked over the nature of his visit and we concluded between ourselves that there was somewhat of a mystery in it, and you must know Sir that it is not likely but I have been visited by many persons that I have had every reason to believe was —, and that is the reason I receive all Strangers and allso many other persons with great caution, and I know he cannot do me any harm if it was his intention. When I wrote to you about the corn I had forgot to tell you that I had sent a good parcel of corn to LONGPARISH, to another person (besides Hunter and Froom). Last Sunday I heard from him, he distributed it to several of his neighbours, he sent word to me they all of them had excelent crops, and are going to plant a considerable Quantity next year, and so are several about this place, I believe there will be some acres planted in this parish next year. Hunt went also to Longparish the day after he was with me, and tried to persuade them that *the corn would give them the Jaundice and the pigs the murrain, but they laught at him,* but whether he got any Bacon there or not I do not know; one more thing I forgot to tell you in my last letter about the *murrain*. He said that you killed a great many pigs with the corn at Barn elm farm, they all died with the murrain, which I said was very strange if true, seeing you so strongly recommended the use of it in the same way to other people; then he told me a good round lie to finish with which I thought not worth telling you about in my last letter, but I will tell you now Just to make you Laugh, he asked me if I thought the corn was *better than potatoes*, I said yes a great deal, he said he thought otherwise and Mr. Cobbett may say what he pleased about it but he once dined with Mr. Cobbett and other Gentlemen when there was all sorts of meat and every thing that was good. But he saw Mr. Cobbett take a great Quantity of potatoes on his plate he thought *half a gallon*, with some butter, and he made his Dinner on that *and nothing else*, and after Dinner *saw him Drink as much as three Bottles of wine.* And as soon as he was gone my Wife

said if I was in that mans place I would lie if I did lie as some one could lie with me, for that lie was too bare faced. I will go to Longparish soon and get all the particulars about his foolishness. I hope the Reform Bill that was to be brought forward munday evening will be satisfactory to the country, for I assure you we are in a dreadful Situation, the Fires are Blazing almost every night, and on Sunday night last Cokham farm in the parish of Barton Stacey was Burnt, Barns Ricks Stables and every thing but the House and a Rick or too that stood at a Distance from the farm yard, if you have a paper that you have done with and can spare that gives the particulars of ministers plan of Reform, I should be much oblig'd if you would send it me, as I want to know how it is like to be and so do many of my neighbours particularly the Chopsticks that gets no news but what they gets from me, and we want to know if possible before Saturday. I hope you and your good family are well.

And I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ENOS DIDDAMS.

*Extract of a Letter from Mr. DIDDAMS, dated
Sutton Scotney, Jan. 21, 1831.*

Respecting my letters relating to Hunt and the Corn, there is nothing in them but what is strictly true, and you are welcome to publish them if you think proper. For I think Hunt has used me very ill, for, since he was with me, he has sent me *another Circular* with two of his penny papers enclosed, No. 8 and No. 9, where he has thought proper to publish a part of our conversation, and some of it is *not true* by a great deal. If ever you should see this paper, he reports that I told him my opinion was that *the Corn was too bad* to give to pigs alone without something with it. He was talking about the murrain, and that the Corn would give it to pigs, particularly young ones. *Now what I did say was this*, I had been told the Corn was *too Strong*, to give to young pigs alone. And I thought the best way would be to have it ground and mix it with some pollard, particularly for young pigs, and if you should publish my letters, I wish you to put this mistatement with it, for I do not like his conduct towards me, and I should like for him to know it, and to know that I want no more of his letters, nor any thing to do with him, as he has not confined himself to *truth* respecting me.

Now observe, the words put *in italics* are so put *by me*, in order to point them out to you as worthy of particular notice; and I have left out *two words*, which it was not necessary to insert. But, observe, in the extract from the letter of the 21st January, the danger of even being where THE LIAR is! Mr. DIDDAMS said, that he had been told that the corn

was *too strong*, if given alone, for young pigs: that is, *too rich*, or *too good*; and this fellow publishes, that Mr. DIDDAMS said, that it was *too bad* for young pigs! The lie suited him for the moment; it seemed as a momentary gratification to his malignity, and that was enough.

Now, people of Preston, I do not state these things to you for the purpose of preventing you from sending this fellow to Parliament again; for that I know to be impossible. I lay them before you, in order to show you what a false thing it is; what a shameless LIAR it is; how clearly everybody sees this; and with what just scorn your letter-franker is treated by those chopsticks of the South, whom some of you consider as ignorant people. "The people at Longparish laughed at him." Do you not feel a little ashamed at reading these words? They laughed at your Cock: those "ignorant" clod-thumpers laughed at so barefaced a LIAR; and they wondered, I dare say, what sort of people those must have been who could choose such a fellow a second time!

But now let us view him as the traducer of Mr. MITCHELL. For years one of his charges against BAINES OF LEEDS was, that he had designated Mr. MITCHELL to have been a government spy in the days of Oliver; and now, he himself calls Mr. MITCHELL a spy. And when did he change? Up to the month of August, 1831, or thereabouts, Mr. Mitchell was, in his letters, his "dear friend Mitchell;" he was to him "as the apple of his eye;" and always concluded his letters to him with "may God bless you and your family." What, then, caused him to see that Mr. Mitchell had been a spy? Why, read Mr. Mitchell's history of the finances, published in the PRESTON CHRONICLE of the 26th of November last, and then you will know. You will know that Mr. Mitchell became a spy precisely at the time when the subscriptions became exhausted, and when he would give or lend no more money out of his own pocket. Mr. Mitchell has not done his duty, his bounden duty, either to himself or to the cause of reform. His account of the expenses of the travelling of THE LIAR; his account of the Stam-

ford-street payments; his account of the cost of the processions; his story of the ten-pound trip to Liverpool; and, above all, his account of the subscription to the Catholic charity ball; all these taken together, and especially when viewed in the same picture with the asking for bacon at Mr. DIDDAMS's, do indeed present us with the "beau ideal of a sturdy beggar;" but this is not enough. We want from Mr. Mitchell's pen, not reflections, not censure, not sarcasm; but a dry and plain statement of sums paid, to whom, and for what, or under what pretence. This is what we want: the whole is, in this case, a mere matter of money. Put down the "lodgings," and in short every disbursement, and to whom paid; into whose hands paid. This is what is wanted; and it would be more amusing than any farce or novel that ever was published. There was, in consequence of the appeal of the people of Preston, a good sum instantly raised in the City, and I had a sum sent from Lynn. But when we found the channel into which it was going, we held our hands, and I sent my money back to Lynn. We saw how the money would go; and we wanted it to go to the people of Preston, who, we soon discovered, would never get a farthing of it.

However, to come back to the SPY-LIE. For more than ten years THE LIAR had called this a false and infamous charge against Mr. Mitchell, and now he makes the charge himself. Mr. Mitchell was put into jail two years by the Government, after the charge was made. No new proof has arisen to support the charge: so that THE LIAR has been calling Mr. Mitchell his "DEAR FRIEND" and "THE APPLE OF HIS EYE," for years, while he believed him to be a government spy; or he now, when the subscriptions are exhausted, calls him a spy, and does not believe him to be one.

When at Leeds, on the 4th of March last, I put Mr. MANN to the test upon this point. I said to him, "THE LIAR calls Mitchell a spy; do you believe that he was one?" Mr. MANN answered, "Well." Oh! no "well," said I. Two years ago, when I was here at

Leeds, one of your grounds of reproach against BAINES was, that he had *falsely* and *basely* called Mitchell a spy of the Government; and do you now *hesitate* upon the subject? "Well," said he, "ask Mr. JOHNSTONE, of Manchester." "I have asked him," said I; "that matter was fully discussed when I was at his house. At the very utmost nothing but *indiscretion* was ever brought home to Mitchell; and after hearing everything, Mr. Thomas Smith of Liverpool was of opinion, that no proof whatever was ever produced to make out treachery in Mitchell. But," added I, "the worst of it is, that YOU could not discover any proof, or presumption, of this sort, till it was wanted to uphold the brazen assertions of THE LIAR; and he could never discover any presumption of guilt in Mitchell, as long as the funds lasted! However, this I know, that when I was here last, YOU called BAINES 'a black-hearted scoundrel' for having called Mitchell a spy; you have been upon the most intimate terms with Mitchell since that time; and now, when the Preston funds fail, you have, all of a sudden, found out that he was a spy; and, what is very curious, YOU and THE LIAR make the discovery just at the same time!"

With regard to Mr. SMITHSON the charge is just as groundless and just as malignant. You are aware, that when Lord MORPETH presented the petition from Leeds for applying the tithes in Ireland to the relief of the poor, a base LIAR published in the newspapers, that the meeting at which this petition was passed was "got up by one SMITHSON, a man who had roasted the Bible." Smithson contradicted this by petition to the House; but his petition could not be received. This was clearly an attempt, on the part of this MALIGNANT LIAR, to throw discredit on this important petition; and this too in order to favour the notorious Tory, SADLER. When therefore I got to Leeds, I was resolved to get at the bottom and at the motive of this malignant lie. I asked Mr. MANN (the declared enemy of Smithson) *what ground* there was for the story, which seemed to

me to have been hatched up for no other purpose than that of injuring a petition which every good man in the country approved of. He did not tell me *what ground*; but said that *he believed the charge to be true*. When I asked Mr. SMITHSON about it, he treated it as a vile lie, invented for the occasion. But now finding MANN, whom I have long known for a very honest and punctual bookseller, and SMITHSON, who is a joiner, and also keeps a beer-house, and whom I had not known before, but of whom very worthy men gave a good character; finding these two at daggers drawn, and causing great division amongst the working people, I wished to come at the bottom of their quarrel, in order that I might produce reconciliation if possible. I began by asking MANN what deadly offence Smithson had committed *against him*; because I was not to be made to believe that the Bible-roasting was his real offence. MANN told me, that SMITHSON had accused him of having been *accessory to the death of Thistlewood*. Here was something indeed to ground hostility upon. I then saw SMITHSON, and besought him to retract the charge, which appeared to me to be absurd. SMITHSON said, that he never made any such charge; but that *seven pounds and some odd shillings* had been collected by some persons (whom he named) to send MANN to London, early in 1820, or late in 1819, to caution THISTLEWOOD *against placing any reliance on support from the country, and to beseech him not to attempt anything desperate or unlawful*; that Mann took the money and never returned it; that he never went near Thistlewood to caution him; and that, if he had done it, that unfortunate man might have been restrained from making the attempt *that cost him his life*. When I asked MANN for his answer to this, he acknowledged that he took the money; that he had never returned the money; said that he went to London for the purpose of executing his mission; but that *he was advised not to go near Thistlewood*; and that he did not go near him. When I asked him WHO it was that advised him thus, he said "Major Cartwright

for one." I reminded him, that *I was in London at that time*; that I frequently saw him there and frequently conversed with him; and yet, that he never even mentioned *to me* this mission to Thistlewood, much less did he ask *my advice*, and that if he had I most assuredly should have advised him to execute his mission faithfully.

Now, men of Preston, honest and sincere as I believe you, I pray you to attend to what I am now going to say. MAJOR CARTWRIGHT is *dead*; and dead men are not witnesses. MANN did not ask MY advice in this case; and *I am alive*. What other *live* man's advice he asked I know not; but he named nobody but the *dead* Major. But there was *another man*, with whom he was *almost constantly*, while in London at that time; and that was HUNT. Now MANN did not tell me that this was one of his *advisers* in the case aforesaid; and I do not *know* that he was; but take the following undeniable facts, and then judge for yourselves. 1. That when Mann was in London, at that time, *he was almost constantly with HUNT*. 2. That Thistlewood had called Hunt *a coward* for his conduct at Manchester in the preceding month of August. 3. That, when Thistlewood and his associates were taken in Cato-street, Hunt published in the newspapers, that they meant to assassinate *him and me* as well as the ministers. 4. That I published a paragraph expressing *my disbelief* in this, as far as related to myself. 5. That, while Thistlewood and the others were waiting their trial, Hunt said, that, if nobody else could be found *to hang* Thistlewood, he would do it with his own hands; "aye, and that *his wife* too, for she *hates me* as much as he does."

You will observe, that all these facts can be proved *upon oath*; and you, like just and sensible and humane men, will consider them well; and the good and honest and deceived RADICALS at Leeds ought to *consider them well*. They ought to see the true object of MANN's recent mission to HUNT at Manchester. They ought to see that the *Bible-roasting lie* is the offspring of this old accusation, now revived by the provocation given by

MANN, in his attempt to cram the great CORN LIAR and FOOL down the throats of the people of Leeds and SADDLER along with him! But now for the proof of this lie.

You will bear in mind, that a petition was agreed upon at Leeds, founded on a motion of Mr. JOSHUA BOWER; that SMITHSON having supported that motion, MANN opposed it, though the very best petition ever presented in our day; that when the petition came before the House, a BASE LIAR published, in his newspaper the next day, that the Leeds *meeting had been got up* by one SMITHSON, who had *roasted the Bible*; thereby saying, in fact, that *those who petitioned against tithes were INFIDELS*. When therefore I got into Yorkshire, and was *met by Mr. MANN*, at Halifax, and afterwards at Dewsbury, I asked him what *foundation* there was for this charge against SMITHSON, which had been attempted to be turned to so mischievous an account. He said, that he believed the charge *to be true*; but he did not mention *any proof* that he had. SMITHSON treated the charge as a base calumny, invented for the purpose of throwing discredit on the meeting and on the petition. Both MANN and SMITHSON sold tickets for the *Lectures*, and I had to see them both frequently. On Friday, the 24th February, my servant, who had been at Mann's shop for something, brought me word, that he had seen an old man there, who had a Bible in a handkerchief, and who said that "*he saw Smithson roast the Bible*, and that he wanted, the Saturday before, to roast that which he had in his handkerchief; that, upon hearing this relation, Mr. Mann CRIED; that the old man said he would make *an affidavit of it*; and that MANN *took him away to make the affidavit*." Soon after hearing this wonderful story, the old man came to see me, having a large thing, in form of a book, in a handkerchief. My servant I kept in the room all the time he was there. He said nothing about Bible-roasting; but, told me, that he was about *ninety years old*, that he lived *eight miles off*, that his name was WALKER, and that a *kind friend* always gave him a bed when he came to Leeds,

as he was not able to walk back the same day, and that he had come in to hear the Lecture, and to see a man whose writings he had so long admired, and that, as the Lecture was put off till Monday, he had come to see me at the Inn.

The old man had been gone about an hour, perhaps, when SMITHSON came to settle something about the Lecture, and he expressed his sorrow for the postponement, because there was an old friend of his *ninety years of age* who had come in on purpose to hear it, and that *he* (Smithson) *always gave the poor old fellow a bed* when he came to Leeds. I asked him the old man's name; he said it was *Walker!* It would have been to partake in the perfidy, not to tell Smithson what this man had said at MANN'S, and about the *affidavit*. He was horror-stricken; and well he might. In about an hour or so he returned to the Inn in great haste, and begged that my servant might go to his house with him. There this old man, in the presence of my servant, said that the Bible-roasting *took place* in 1795, when Smithson was a child in petticoats, and that, as to the last Saturday's affair, it was a mere joke in derision of the lie in the House of Commons. In short, the old man here negatived all that he had said at MANN'S shop, and that had made Mr. Mann CRY! I told Mr. MANN how false this old Walker was, and besought him to confess his error. He said he had *other witnesses*. But honest men of Leeds, if he have other witnesses, *why* did he not *name* them to me, and why, O why! did he go away with this old Walker to get HIS AFFIDAVIT! And why, O why! was NOT that affidavit made! Why, when the story came before persons not bereft of their senses by feelings of deadly enmity, it was seen that it was false, and that the attempt to uphold it by such means must cover all the parties with everlasting infamy.

Now, good people of Preston and "Radical Union" men of Leeds, it is in the nature of honesty and sincerity *not to be suspicious*; not to be suspicious is to be exposed to deception by cunning knaves and bold impostors. You have been deceived in consequence of your own frank-

ness and sincerity; any errors that you may have committed in consequence of that deception are excusable; but when you are *undeceived*, then to persevere in error is not excusable. I can neither gain by the correction of your errors, nor lose by your perseverance in them. In addressing you upon this occasion, I have no motive other than that of wishing you to act a part tending to the good of the country, and to your own well-being; and in the hope that you will act that part, I remain your obliged and faithful friend, and most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

TO COUNTRY PEOPLE.

LET nobody persuade you to quit England to go to COLONIES. You are sure, either to die speedily or to lead most degraded and miserable lives. If you can get to live under the cheap government of the UNITED STATES, it may be worth the voyage; but if you go to Colonies, misery for life is your lot. However, there is this to be said; that those who go to these Colonies are such stupid and base creatures as not to be fit to be treated in any way other than as cattle. But you, good *bat-men* of Kent and Sussex, stay you at home, and keep the invaders away; or, if you do move, move only to the United States.

WM. COBBETT.

LEEDS POLITICAL UNION.

On the 5th of April a general meeting of the members of this Union was held at the Commercial Buildings, to hear the letters of T. B. Macaulay, John Marshall, jun., and M. T. Sadler, Esqrs., on the vital question of tithes;

Mr. JOSHUA BOWER in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the business, briefly stated the object of the meeting.

Mr. LEES, the secretary, said, that in consequence of the great interest which was attached to the tithe question, he had been instructed by the council of

the Leeds Political Union to address the following letter to each of the three candidates for the representation of the borough of Leeds :—

Council-Room, March 13, 1832.

SIR,—The question of tithes for Ireland is every day increasing its interest in the minds of the thinking part of the community, and, from its importance, claims (after the Reform Bill) the first attention of our legislators, and of those who may be instrumental in raising them to that distinguished honour. With this impression, the Leeds Political Union deem it an indispensable duty they owe to themselves and their posterity, not to support any candidate for the representation of Leeds, who will not most explicitly and frankly avow his sentiments upon this vital subject.

The council have therefore authorised us to submit the enclosed questions to the consideration of each candidate, and to request that you, as one, would favour me with your early opinion, that I may lay the same before the meeting on Tuesday next.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,

J. LEES, Secretary.

To Messrs. Macaulay, Sadler, and Marshall.

Do you consider the revenues of the church to be public or private property?

What is your opinion respecting the appropriation of a part of the immense wealth of the church to the necessities of the state?

What is your opinion of the Leeds petition respecting Irish Tithes, and their appropriation to the *poor*, the clergy, and the church equally?

In your opinion, ought the present incumbents to receive the whole or any part of their present income during life?

To this letter the following answers had been received :—

FROM T. B. MACAULAY.

London, March 15, 1832.

SIR,—I highly approve of the resolu-

tion which has been formed by the gentlemen in whose name you have written, not to support any candidate who will not explicitly and frankly avow his sentiments upon the question of tithes. On this, and on every subject, my opinions, whether popular or unpopular, shall be openly and fearlessly stated.

I will answer your questions as shortly and clearly as I can.

To the first I say, that in my opinion part of the church revenues is private property, and part public property. An advowson which has come by purchase or by inheritance, into the hands of an individual, seems to me just as much his property as his house. It may be taken from him for public purposes, just as his house might be taken from him in order to make a canal or a rail-road; but, as in the case of his house, so in the case of his advowson, full compensation ought to be given. There are, however, if I am rightly informed, very few advowsons of this kind in Ireland.

The revenues of bishoprics, of deans and chapters, of benefices to which the crown nominates, are, in my opinion, strictly public property, and may, without injustice to any human being, be applied by the legislature to public purposes, as soon as the existing interests expire. Almost all the church property of Ireland is of this latter kind. The revenues of the church of Ireland are, therefore, in my judgment, public property.

To the second question I answer, that a considerable portion of the church property ought, in my opinion, to be applied to public services, due regard being had to existing interests.

To the third question I answer, that in my opinion it is of little consequence to us now what may have been the distribution of the tithes seven hundred years ago. Whatever may have been the original distribution, we know that for some centuries the tithes have not been equally divided between the church, the clergy, and the poor; and that no advowson or presentation has for some centuries been bought or sold, with the understanding that the tithes were to be so divided. The claim, if it ever ex-

isted, has been dormant for many generations. The discussion of it may now amuse antiquarians; but it is, I think, not a subject worthy of the grave consideration of statesmen.

Consider, too, that if the tithes are to be now appropriated to their own original purposes, the clergyman's third will, both in England and Ireland, go to the Catholic priest: for it was for the support of the Catholic religion that tithes were originally instituted in this country. We cannot apply the tithe to its original uses, without establishing the Catholic religion again.

I by no means say that it may not be very proper to apply a large part of the church property of Ireland to the relief of the poor. But if this is done, it ought to be done because it is useful and humane to do it, and not from any regard to a law which, if it ever existed, has been obsolete for many hundreds of years.

The fourth question I am not sure that I quite understand. I do not know what is meant by the abolition of tithes as contra-distinguished from commutation. The mode of collecting the tithe may be changed. The appropriation of the tithe may be changed, but the tithe itself cannot be abolished. That part of the produce which the clergyman receives must always remain. Somebody must have it. If nobody else takes it, the landlord, who clearly has no right to it, will take it. Indeed all the preceding questions imply that the tithe is to remain, though collected and appropriated on new principles. If tithe is abolished, it cannot be appropriated to the necessities of the state, to use the words of the second question; or appropriated to the poor, the clergy, and the church equally, to use the words of the third question.

To the last question I answer that the present incumbents ought, in my opinion, to receive the whole of their revenues during life. If their life interest be not property they have no claim whatever. If it be, as I believe it to be, property in the strictest sense, they have a claim to the whole.

Whatever you may think of these

answers, you will, I trust, be of opinion that they are frank and explicit.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

T. B. MACAULAY. (Applause.)

FROM JOHN MARSHALL.

Headingley, Leeds, March 19th, 1832.

SIR,—I will reply as distinctly as I am able to the inquiries made by you on behalf of the Leeds Political Union, as to my opinions on several points regarding the tithes and the revenues of the national church.

I am decidedly of opinion that the greater part of the revenues of the church are public and not private property; that they should be appropriated to the securing a proper and sufficient provision for the support of religion; and that it is only after having attained this object, that they should be applied to such other purposes as are most beneficial to the state.

I agree with the principle on which the Leeds petition is grounded, but I think that the manner in which the Irish tithes ought to be appropriated, requires further consideration. I am of opinion that there should be an entire abolition of tithes in Ireland, by a commutation of them for a fixed amount chargeable on the owners of land.

I think the present incumbents, who do the duties of their office, have an equitable claim to the enjoyment of their incomes for life.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. MARSHALL, jun.

To Mr. J. Lees,
Secretary to the Leeds Political Union.

FROM M. T. SADLER.

London, March 28th, 1832.

SIR,—I received your letter some days ago, which I regret I have not previously answered. I trust, however, that constant and pressing engagements in reference to an important public measure now in progress (the Factories Regulation Bill) will apologise for the delay, as also for the haste in which I

am now obliged to address you on the subject of the Irish tithes, to which your letter refers. I have expressed myself so recently and so much at large, at the public meeting in which yourself, the president, and a large portion of the council and members of the Union to which you belong, were, I believe, present, that I have really nothing further to add, excepting that I am more and more convinced that an adequate provision for the starving poor of Ireland is one of the first duties of the legislature, and ought to be no longer delayed* for any question, however important; an opinion to which I am glad to find myself sanctioned by the press here, and especially by that part of it, with whose views you, probably, most nearly concur. I cherish hope, therefore, that, on a candid and mature consideration of the subject, and seeing how deeply the rights of the deserted and starving poor of Ireland are implicated, and also the interests of the operative classes of England, whose wages are grievously diminished by a multitude of Irish competitors, who are, literally speaking, now starved out of their own country, I shall have your good wishes in favour of the endeavour which I am about to renew for poor-laws in Ireland, as I hope I have also for the success of the attempt in which I am now anxiously engaged, and which has prevented me from replying to your letter in due course.

I remain your faithful servant,
MICHAEL THOMAS SADLER.

To Mr. Joseph Lees, &c. &c.

P.S. With all due respect to yourself, I am obliged to state that I have it not in my power to continue the correspondence on this subject, having more communications from the secretaries of the operative societies of Great Britain, in reference to the important subject which I have undertaken, and engagements upon my hand in reference to it, than I can properly attend to.

* Vide *Globe* newspaper, March 31.—“We should like to see the provision for the poor (of Ireland) first.” *Morning Chronicle*, March 22.—“We also should like to see the provision for the poor first.”

The above letter was addressed to—
“Mr. Joseph Lees, Secretary, Leeds and Holbeck Union, Leeds.”

Mr. LEES, having read the letters, said, that he considered that of Mr. Sadler, being addressed to him as the Secretary of the Leeds and Hulbeck Union, a direct insult both to himself and to the Union, inasmuch as the body of his letter to Mr. Sadler distinctly stated, that he wrote on behalf of the Leeds Political Union, which must have been before him at the time he answered. He wished to make but one observation upon the purport of Mr. Sadler's answer, and that was, that his apology for not answering sooner was the pressure of business. Now five questions had been proposed to him relative to the tithes—Mr. Marshall had answered the whole in 188 words, whilst Mr. Sadler had made use of 390 words without answering one question.

Mr. T. T. METCALFE, after an able speech in which he spoke in high terms of the splendid talents and excellent principles of Mr. Macaulay, and of the deserved estimation in which Mr. John Marshall was held by his townsmen, concluded by proposing—

“That the thanks of this meeting are due to T. B. Macaulay and John Marshall, Jun., Esquires, for their frank, prompt, and manly answers to the questions of the Political Council respecting the great subject of Tithes, and that the Secretary of the Union be instructed to communicate the same to each of the parties.”

Mr. HEALD, in an eloquent and argumentative speech, seconded the motion, which was put by the chairman, and carried with only one dissentient.

Both the mover and seconder of this resolution spoke of Mr. Macaulay and Mr. John Marshall as most fit and proper persons to represent this borough in Parliament, and were frequently and loudly cheered.

Mr. SMITHSON said that he highly approved of the resolution, but thought that the meeting should not pledge themselves to any particular candidates.

The CHAIRMAN said, he did not wish any pledge to be given, but the letters

of Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Marshall proved them to be men of talents and men of principle; as to Mr. Sadler offering himself to represent Leeds, when he had endeavoured, by opposing the Reform Bill, to prevent the electors from returning members, it was ridiculous; and he thought even the aristocrats must laugh at the man who could act so inconsistent and dishonourable a part. (Laughter and cheers.)

The meeting showed their opinion of Mr. Sadler's disingenuous and evasive answer, by passing over his *merits* in entire silence. To one of the five questions proposed to Mr. Sadler, his letter is an answer, by reference: but to the other four, none of which were discussed at the Leeds meeting, it is no answer whatever.

Mr. LEES proposed—

"That this meeting view with great satisfaction the donation of ten pounds given to the Leeds Political Union by John Marshall, Esq., as a decided proof of his liberality of both purse and political principle, and also as furnishing the best lesson to the higher orders of society, to assist their poorer neighbours to obtain those liberties, without which the distinction riches confer will soon cease to exist. This meeting, therefore, offer him their sincere acknowledgments, and hope they may long enjoy his friendship and confidence."

Mr. Z. ORRELL seconded the resolution, which was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. Grosvenor, of Hunslet, was appointed one of the political council for the middle class, in the room of Mr. Blaxland, who has left Leeds.

The meeting was then adjourned to next Thursday evening, at half-past seven o'clock.

The Chairman having left the chair, it was taken by Mr. Nichols, when, on the motion of Mr. T. T. Metcalfe, seconded by Mr. E. Matterson, the thanks of the meeting were given to Mr. Joshua Bower for his able and impartial conduct in the chair, and the meeting separated.

NATIONAL POLITICAL UNION.

The council of this union met on the 11th April; Mr. OWEN in the chair.

The SECRETARY stated that three pounds were received in support of the lectures, under the superintendence of the council, and a dictionary from Mr. Berthold.

The Rev. Mr. Fox, in preferring his motion, said, that the crisis is coming, or come, towards which institutions of this kind have been looking, and that shall determine whether the right shall be demanded in a more decided manner than usual. What will be necessary to be done, should now require the most intense consideration of the council; and to accomplish which is our determination, by legal, peaceful, but determined action, which may ensure that success sought and required; for a nation to be freed is sufficient that she wills it—and that she wills it not from intemperance, but knowledge. It was for this purpose the council were elected by the union, and he trusted that every member of it will be found at his post, and meet it by some determined measure. He therefore moved "*that should the Reform Bill be rejected, a special meeting of the council should be held on the following evening, to consider what means should be adopted in such an unfortunate exigency.*"

Mr. ROGERS seconded the motion, and vindicated the council from an apparent apathy concerning the fate of reform, as they have depended solely on my Lord Grey, who had pledged himself so strenuously and decidedly—and whose pledges were sincere—that the bill should be carried. They did not, therefore, suggest means to Lord Grey, rather rendering themselves liable to the charge of inaction than of impeding the progress of the bill by idle suggestions. He alluded to the *non-payment of taxes* in case of rejection; for he believed that the opinion was general concerning the mode to be adopted; nay, he considered that the rejection of the Reform Bill should be a warning to *every tradesman to shut up his shop, meet in the squares, and to deliberate; and from*

deliberation, proceed to action, should that be found necessary.

Mr. CARPENTER submitted to the meeting, whether, even if the bill were not rejected, if the passing the second reading was merely to *smother* or *mutilate* the bill, a meeting should not be similarly called: for the democratic parts of the bill, were it carried, will be annihilated, and its tendency *rendered useless*, under the modifications likely to be made. Many Lords will vote for the second reading of the bill, not to render themselves obnoxious, and yet to render their own party and views victorious by the manner in which they will be able to mangle it in committee.

The motion of Mr. Fox's was unanimously agreed to.

IRISH TITHES.

NORTHERN POLITICAL UNION.

To the honourable House of Commons, the Petition of the Chairman, acting in Behalf and under the Direction of the Council of the Northern Political Union,

Humbly sheweth,

That your petitioners hear with regret, that his Majesty's Ministers have proposed to your honourable House to pass a bill to cause the arrears of tithe, which the clergy of the church of Ireland have been unable to collect, to be paid or advanced out of the proceeds of taxes levied upon the people of England.

That your petitioners, were the Irish church even that which it has been described to be, an establishment for the support and propagation of the Protestant religion, as by law established, would consider such a measure as this in the highest degree unjust.

That your petitioners, however, are aware of the real nature of the establishment or institution, styled the Irish Church, and beg to represent the same to your honourable House, in order that your honourable House may at once see the justice of the prayer of this their petition.

That, accordingly, your petitioners beg to state to your honourable House, in the emphatic words of William Cobbett, as used in a petition upon the subject of the Irish church, presented to your honourable House in the year 1829; that there are in Ireland 3403 parishes; that these are moulded into 515 livings; and that, therefore, each parson has, on an average the tithes and glebes of more than nine parishes; that this is not the worst, however, for that many of the livings are united, and that the whole 3403 parishes are divided amongst less than 350 parsons;

that of the 3403 parishes there are only 139 that have parsonage houses, so that there is now remaining only one parsonage house to every 24 parishes, and only 465 that have any churches, or 1 church to 7 parishes; and that even in these residences of the incumbent, or even a curate, seldom takes place for any length of time; that the church, as by law established, would seem to be merely the means of making, out of the public resources, provision for certain families and parsons; that of the 4 archbishops and 18 bishops of the Irish church, as by law established, there are, as your petitioners believe, 14 who are by blood or marriage, related to Peers; that a similar principle appears to your humble petitioners to prevail in the filling of the other dignities and livings; and that, therefore, the Irish church, as by law established, really does seem to your humble petitioners to exist for no purpose other than that of furnishing the Government with the means of bestowing money on the aristocracy.

That your petitioners, looking at the state of the revenue, and looking at the general truth of the foregoing statement, entreat your honourable House not to apply any portion of taxes, so much wanted for the service of the country, to the payment of that which your petitioners cannot but consider as a set of unmerited pensions bestowed upon the sons, nephews, cousins, and other relations, of the aristocracy, and, upon the sons, nephews, cousins, and other relations of the favourites, male or female, of the aristocracy.

That your petitioners, therefore, in conclusion, humbly entreat your honourable House not to sanction any bill causing the arrears of the tithes of the Irish church to be paid out of taxes levied upon Englishmen.

And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c.

CHARLES ATTWOOD, Chairman.

Eldon Coffee-Rooms, April 3, 1832.

The following petition was presented to the Lords by Lord KING, on 30th of March.

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned individuals, members of council of the Political Union, of the town of Bradford in the county of Wilts,

Humbly sheweth,

That your petitioners have viewed with grief, the rejection of the late bill for the amending the representation of England and Wales, by your right honourable House, without going into committee thereon.

That your petitioners confiding in the well-

known justice, honour, and wisdom, of your right honourable House, feel assured, that if your right honourable House had proceeded with the aforesaid bill in committee of your right honourable House, and had it been proved to the satisfaction of such committee that the majority of the Commons House of Parliament was returned by borough proprietors and close corporations, your petitioners feel confident that your right honourable House would have allowed that those so sent could not be the representatives of the people; but the representatives of such borough proprietors and corporations only.

That your petitioners do not believe that the bill for the amending the representation of England and Wales is free from error; but that in the opinion of your petitioners, had such a representation been in existence forty years ago, it would in some measure have prevented the accumulation of an enormous national debt, the present long list of useless places and unmerited pensions, and would have rendered the present standing army useless and unnecessary.

That your petitioners believe that the long-procrastinated delay of passing the bill for the amending of the representation of England and Wales, has been deeply injurious to trade and commerce, thereby affecting the best interest of the community.

That your petitioners feel assured that your Lordships are aware that according to the constitution, and the ancient law of the land, the House of Commons was designed to represent the opinions of the people; and as that House, by an immense majority of its members, has declared itself to be radically bad, and unable to represent such opinions, they hope that your right honourable House will throw no obstacle in the passing of the aforesaid bill (thereby disappointing the just wishes of millions), but pass the same with as little delay as the forms of your right honourable House will admit.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

COBBETT'S CORN,

RAISED LAST YEAR,

BY RICHARD ILES, FAIRFORD,

GLOUCESTERSHIRE,

ON SALE FOR SEED.

TO THE PUBLIC.

It now being a well-authenticated truth, that the species of Indian Corn, best known by the appellation of "Cobbett's Corn" (it being introduced into this country by Mr. WILLIAM COBBETT, jun.; and the growth of it so sedulously, so laudably, and successfully propagated by his father), that this corn will fully ripen in this climate; that it will flourish and become fruitful, under the employment

of suitable means of cultivation, on every description of soil excepting that which has a wet bottom; that it is capable of produce prodigiously great, as compared even to the best crops raised in this country of any other description of grain; that a mixture of a suitable quantity of the corn-flour with wheat-flour will make bread that is preferable to that which is made wholly of the latter; that for fattening of pigs it has a preference to barley, quantity for quantity, in a large degree; that the tops of the corn, as also its leaves and its stalks, are a valuable provender for horses, for cattle, and for sheep in winter. That, as from articles in *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register* of the 5th, 12th, 19th, and 26th of November last; and from a large mass of information from persons of most credible testimony residing in the east and north, as well as of the west and south of England, not forgetting Scotland; which appeared also in the *Register* of the next ensuing December (some of these persons, all of them growers of the corn, stating their produce to have been 120 bushels, and in some instances 160, of shelled corn to the acre). That as all these facts, and statements of facts, wholly incontrovertible as they are, make out and establish a reputation of promise of great national benefit for this new sort of grain. I have, therefore, only to state that I have the corn to sell for seed, upon a scale of price and quantity hereafter to be specified; first, however, briefly showing the practical ground upon which I offer it to the judgment of the public.

On $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre and $9\frac{1}{2}$ poles of ground my produce, as the reader may perceive from the following arrangement of figures, was in the full proportion of 68 bushels of shelled corn to the acre. It is of the finest quality, and in the best state of preservation.

R. P.	Ears.	Shelled Corn.
On 0 $26\frac{1}{2}$	26 Bushels.	13 Bushels.
On 0 $5\frac{1}{2}$	32 Bushels.	16 Bushels.
On 1 $17\frac{1}{2}$	46 Bushels.	23 Bushels.

Total 3 $9\frac{1}{2}$ 104 Bushels. 52 Bushels.

On the $26\frac{1}{2}$ poles planted the third week in May it will be perceived, that there is a produce proportionate to nearly 80 bushels of shelled corn to the acre. Let it, however, be observed, that on this piece of ground there was an omission of the necessary interculture by the horse plough,* which materially reduced the crop. On the two other pieces, planted, I believe, in the last week in May and first in June, which produced the finest corn, there was a deficiency of full one half of the plants by the wire worm, rabbits, and birds; so that I do not consider the quantity of 90, or even 100 bushels as an extraordinary quantity for the average of the soils of this country to produce.

* For complete instructions, for propagating, cultivating, harvesting, and preserving the corn, I strongly recommend, as essential, the perusal of Mr. Cobbett's Treatise.

TABLE OF PRICES,

When planted in Rows of 3 feet apart, and the Plants 8 inches in the Row.

	Rods.	£.	s.	d.
Quantity for planting <i>nearly</i>	2 ..	0	0	2
Ditto, in the same proportion,	from 1 to 5 ..	0	0	5
Ditto, for planting	10 ..	0	1	0
Ditto, ditto	20 ..	0	2	6
Ditto, ditto	40 ..	0	5	0
Ditto, ditto	80 ..	0	10	0
Ditto, ditto (1 acre)	160 ..	1	0	0

It will be observed, that the prices of this scale for the smaller quantities are in proportion lower than those of the larger quantities. This is intended for the advantage of the labouring man in planting for his first crop.

RICHARD ILES.

Fairford, April 9, 1832.

For instructions to labourers for raising it, see *Two-penny Trash*, No. 10, for the month of April, 1831.

N. B. Money payments will reasonably be expected, especially from strangers; but orders will be instantly attended to, and corn conveyed without delay to any reasonable distance.

SEEDS

FOR SALE AT MR. COBBETT'S SHOP,
No. 11, BOLT-COURT, FLEET-STREET.

February, 1832.

LOCUST SEED.

Very fine and fresh, at 6s. a pound. For instructions relative to sowing of these seeds, for rearing the plants, for making plantations of them, for preparing the land to receive them, for the after cultivations, for the pruning, and for the application of the timber; for all these see my "WOODLANDS;" or TREATISE ON TIMBER TREES AND UNDERWOOD. 8vo. 14s.

SWEDISH TURNIP SEED.

Any quantity under 10lbs., 10d. a pound; and any quantity above 10lbs. and under 50lbs., 9½d. a pound; any quantity above 50lbs., 9d. a pound; above 100lbs., 8½d. A parcel of seed may be sent to any part of the kingdom; I will find proper bags, will send it to any coach or van or wagon, and have it booked at my expense; but the money must be paid at my shop before the seed be sent away; in consideration of which I have made due allowance in the price.

If the quantity be small, any friend can call and get it for a friend in the country; if the quantity be large, it may be sent by me. The plants were raised from seed given me by Mr. PEPPERCORN (of Southwell, Bedfordshire), in 1823. He gave it me as the finest sort that he had ever seen. I raised some plants (for use) in my garden every year; but, at Barn-Elm I raised a whole field of it, and had 320 bushels of seed upon 13 acres of land. I pledge my word, that there was not one single turnip in the whole field (which bore seed) not of the true kind. There was but one of a suspicious look, and that one I pulled up and threw away. So that I warrant this seed as being perfectly true, and as having proceeded from plants with small necks and greens, and with that reddish tinge round the collar which is the sure sign of the best sort.

MANGEL-WURZEL SEED.

Any quantity under 10lbs., 7½d. a pound; any quantity above 10lbs. and under 50lbs., 7d. a pound; any quantity above 50lbs., 6½d. a pound; any quantity above 100lbs., 6d. a pound. The selling at the same place as above; the payment in the same manner. This seed was also grown at Barn-Elm farm, the summer before the last. It is a seed which is just as good at ten years old as at one.—The plants were raised in seed-beds in 1828; they were selected, and those of the deepest red planted out in a field of 13 acres, which was admired by all who saw it, as a most even, true, and beautiful field of the kind. The crop was very large; and out of it were again selected the plants from which my present stock of seed was growed; though, indeed, there was little room for selection, where all were so good and true. I got my seed from Mr. PYM, of Reigate, who raised it from plants proceeding from seed that I had given him, which seed I had raised at Worth, in Sussex; and, all the way through, the greatest care had been taken to raise seed from no plant of a dubious character.—This seed, therefore, I warrant as the very best of the kind.—A score or two of persons, who sowed

of this seed last year, have given me an account of the large crops they have had from it, and have all borne testimony to its being the truest seed they ever saw of the kind. I sell these seeds *much cheaper* than true seed, of the same sorts, can be got at any other place; but I have a *right* to do this, and I choose to exercise my right. My seeds are kept with great care in a proper place; and I not only warrant the *sort*, but also, that *every seed grow*, if properly put into the ground.

USES OF COBBETT-CORN FLOUR.

We use the *corn-flour* in my family, **FIRST** as *bread*, two-thirds wheaten and one-third corn-flour; **SECOND**, in *batter puddings baked*, a pound of flour, a quart of water, two eggs, though these last are not necessary; **THIRD**, in *plum-puddings*, a pound of flour, a pint of water, half a pound of suet, the plums, and no eggs; **FOURTH**, in *plain suet-puddings*, and the same way, omitting the plums; **FIFTH**, in *little round dumplings*, with suet or without, and though they are apt to break, they are very good in this way; in broth, to thicken it, for which use it is beyond all measure better than wheaten-flour.

Now, to make **BREAD**, the following are the instructions which I have received from Mr. SAPSFORD, baker, No. 20, the corner of Queen Anne-street, Wimpole-street, Marybone. As I have frequently observed, the corn-flour is not so adhesive, that is to say, clammy, as the wheat and rye flour are. It is, therefore, necessary; or, at least, it is best to use it, one-third corn-flour and two-thirds wheat or rye flour. The rye and the corn do not make bread so bright as the wheat and the corn, nor quite so light; but it is as good bread as I ever wish to eat, and I would always have it if I could. Now, for the instructions to make bread with wheat-flour and corn-flour. Suppose you are going to make a batch, consisting of thirty pounds of flour; you will have of course twenty pounds of wheat-flour and ten pounds of corn-flour. Set your sponge with the wheat-flour only. As soon as you have done that, put ten

pints of water (warm in cold weather, and cold in hot weather) to the corn-flour; and mix the flour up with the water; and there let it be for the present. When the wheat sponge has risen, and has fallen again, take the wetted-up corn-flour, and work it in with the wheat sponge, and with the dry wheat-flour that has been round the sponge. Let the whole remain fermenting together for about half an hour; and then make up the loaves and put them into the oven. The remainder of the process every one knows. These instructions I have, as I said before, from Mr. Sapsford; and I recollect also, that this is the way in which the Americans make their bread. The bread in Long Island is made nearly always with rye and corn-flour, that being a beautiful country for rye, and not so very good for wheat. I should add here, that there is some little precaution necessary with regard to the grinding of the corn. The explanation given to me is this: that to do it well, it ought to be ground twice, and between stones such as are used in the grinding of cone-wheat, which is a bearded wheat, which some people call rivets. This, however, is a difficulty which will be got over at once as soon as there shall be only ten small fields of this corn in a county.

I sell it according to the following table:—

If planted in rows 3 feet apart, and the plants 8 inches in the row,

	PRICE.		
	£.	s.	d.
1 Ear will plant nearly TWO RODS	0	0	3½
1 Bunch will plant more than SEVEN RODS.....	0	1	0
6 Bunches will plant more than 40 rods, or a quarter of an acre..	0	5	6
12 Bunches will plant more than 80 rods, or half an acre	0	10	6½
25 Bunches will plant more than 160 rods, or an acre	1	0	0

From the **LONDON GAZETTE**,

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1832.

INSOLVENTS.

CRAFTER, J., Tooley-street, Southwark, victualler.

FORTNUM, C., Nunhead-hill, Peckham rye, Surrey, brick-maker.

GARDINER, W. H., Nortonfalgate, ironmonger.
HATTON, G., Reading, Berkshire, chinaman.

BANKRUPTCY ENLARGED.

WISEMAN, I., Norwich, silkman.

BANKRUPTCIES SUPERSEDED.

HOUGHTON, T., Liverpool, builder.

MACKAY, J., Broad-street, insurance-broker.

BANKRUPTS.

CARTER, J., Worksop, Notts, corn-factor.

GOBLE, J. and G., Kentish-buildings, Southwark, hop-factors.

MARSHALL, W., Holborn-bars, pocket-book-maker.

MAY, W. H., Great George-street, Mansion-house, merchant.

PARKER, S., Argyle-place, Regent-street, bronzist and lamp-maker.

TAYLOR, W., Malden, Surrey, gunpowder-manufacturer.

TURNER, P., Norwich, confectioner.

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1832.

INSOLVENTS.

CROOKS, G., Anglesea-place Limehouse, baker.

ELLA, J. White-Conduit-terrace, Islington.

BANKRUPTCY ENLARGED.

THOMAS, R., late of Glyn, Glamorganshire, cattle-dealer.

BANKRUPTS.

AKERS, J. S., Birmingham, victualler.

ESAM, E., Thame, Oxfordshire, draper.

GALLIER, J., Park-street, Grosvenor-square, carpenter.

HAYNES, T., Great Yarmouth, cabinet-maker.

HENESEY, R., Drury-lane, timber-merch.

LATHAM, J., late of Llanelly, Carmarthen-shire, spirit-merchant.

LEACH, C., New Manor-st., Chelsea, baker.

NEWLAND, N., and Henry White, Portsea, drapers.

NICHOLS, J. and T. Walter, Skinner-street, ironmongers.

ORBELL, J., Great Henny, Essex, miller.

PINKEMAN, J., late of White Lion-st., Pentonville, victualler.

POWER, R. J. W., Havant, Southampton, fellmonger.

SCORAH, W., East Retford, Nottinghamshire, cabinet-maker.

WAYLING, R., jun., late of Ramsey, Essex, butcher.

WILKINSON, R., Copthall-buildings, accountant.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

KER, A., Edinburgh, cabinet-maker.

MUCKARSIE, J., Dundee, grocer.

RITCHIE, J., Perth, merchant.

TORRANCE, W., Glasgow, merchant.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, APRIL 9.—Supplies have been, since this day se'nnight, wheat, barley, oats, beans, peas, and seeds, of from all quarters, very limited; of English malt, and English, Irish, and Scotch flour, moderately good.

As this day's market was tolerably well attended both by London and country buyers, and most kind of grain, as above stated, in but limited supply, advanced prices were pretty generally, and somewhat stiffly demanded; but as these were not very willingly submitted to, the trade was, particularly during the two first hours of business, with each kind of corn, as also malt, pulse, seeds, and flour, very dull; with wheat, barley, and oats, at an advance of about 1s. per quarter: with peas, beans, malt, seeds, and flour, at last Monday's prices.

Wheat	51s. to 66s.
Rye	31s. to 33s.
Barley	25s. to 34s.
— fine	35s. to 42s.
Peas, White	35s. to 39s.
— Boilers	38s. to 44s.
— Grey	33s. to 37s.
Beans, Old	34s. to 36s.
— Tick	33s. to 37s.
Oats, Potatoe	25s. to 28s.
— Poland	23s. to 26s.
— Feed	19s. to 24s.
Flour, per sack	55s. to 60s.

PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, 44s. to 49s. per cwt.
— Sides, new ... 48s. to 49s.
Pork, India, new ... 130s. 0d. to —s.
Pork, Mess, new ... —s. 0d. to —s. per barl.
Butter, Belfast ... 82s. to 86s. per cwt.
— Carlow ... 80s. to 90s.
— Cork ... 86s. to 88s.
— Limerick ... 84s. to 88s.
— Waterford ... 80s. to 86s.
— Dublin ... 74s. to 76s.
Cheese, Cheshire ... 56s. to 76s.
— Gloucester, Double ... 56s. to 64s.
— Gloucester, Single ... 48s. to 54s.
— Edam ... 48s. to 54s.
— Gouda ... 48s. to 50s.
Hams, Irish ... 56s. to 58s.

SMITHFIELD.—April 9.

This day's supply of beasts was rather limited as to numbers, but as to quality very prime: of small stock, moderately good as to both. The trade was, in the whole, dull: with beef at an advance; veal at a depression of 2d. per stone; with mutton, lamb, and pork, at Friday's quotations.

Beasts, 2,394; sheep and lambs, 18,200; calves, 101; pigs, 160.

MARK-LANE.—Friday, April 13.

The arrivals this week are moderate, and the prices full as high as on Monday.

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent. } Fri. Sat. Mon. Tues. Wed. Thur.						
Cons. Ann. }	83½	83½	83½	83½	83½	83½

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

*New Edition.***COBBETT'S Spelling-Book;***(Price 2s.)*

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—Of this work sixty thousand copies have now been published. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. An ITALIAN GRAMMAR, by Mr. JAMES PAUL COBBETT.—Being a Plain and Compendious Introduction to the Study of Italian. Price 6s.

3. COTTAGE ECONOMY.—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writings also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

4. YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

5. The ENGLISH GARDENER; or, a Treatise on the situation, soil, enclosing and laying out, of Kitchen Gardens; on the making and managing of Hot-beds and Green-houses; and on the propagation and cultivation of all sorts of Kitchen Garden Plants, and of Fruit Trees, whether of the Garden or the Orchard. And also, on the formation of Shrubberies and Flower Gardens. Price 6s.

6. THE WOODLANDS; or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

7. FRENCH GRAMMAR; or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price bound in boards, 5s.

8. THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE.

Just now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds. To be had at No. 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.

USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

This day is published, price only One Penny, an Abridgment of COLONEL MACERONE'S

DEFENSIVE INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PEOPLE, illustrated with spirited engravings. This little book is intended for general circulation, and the friends of liberty are respectfully solicited to lend their earnest endeavours to carry this intention into effect. "He that hath an ear to hear let him hear."

London: H. Hetherington, 13, Kingsgate-street, Holborn; W. Strange, 21, Paternoster-row; and all Booksellers in town and country.

THE MARK LANE EXPRESS; a New Agricultural and Trading NEWS-PAPER, of the largest size, price only Seven-pence.—Published every Monday evening, in time for the Post.

In it will be found—The fullest particulars of Monday's Market at Mark Lane, and all the other Markets, Home and Foreign, of the Week; Meat Markets, and Reports of Fat and Lean Stock Markets; State of the Wool Trade, Home, Colonial, and Foreign, Current Prices, &c.; all important matters occurring in the Agricultural and Trading World; a List of the principal Fairs and Markets to take place every ensuing Week; all Improvements, Patents, &c.; Concise Statements of the Effects of New Decisions in Courts of Law, and the earliest Notice of Motions and Bills in Parliament affecting the interests of Landlords, Tenants, Manufacturers, &c.; particular attention to all changes in the Laws of moment to the Maltster and Retail Brewer, the Prices of Malt and Hops, Wine, Spirits, &c.; Quantity on hand, &c.; and all that can constitute a desirable Family Newspaper and Record of Facts, &c. for the information and guidance of all men of business throughout the Empire.

N. B. The Keepers of Commercial Inns, and those who have Ordinaries on Market Days, attended by Farmers, Cornfactors, Millers, Yeomen of the County, &c., will find the "Mark-Lane Express" the best and cheapest Monday Paper they can lay upon their tables for the use of their Customers.

Orders received by the Publisher, W. Jenkinson, at the Office, 336, Strand, London; and by all Booksellers, Newsmen, and Clerks of the Roads, throughout the Empire.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.